This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

RARIES
302 5

THE

CHURCH REVIEW,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

VOLUME IX.—1856-57.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.:

GEORGE B. BASSETT & CO., 115 CHAPEL STREET.
NEW YORK: DANA & COMPANY, 381 BROADWAY.
LONDON: TRUBNER & CO., 12 PATERNOSTER-ROW.
OXFORD: J. H. PARKER.

MDCCCLVII.

Printed by
THOMAS J. STAFFORD,
New Haven, Conn.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IX.

NO. I.

ART. I.—Inspiration, ... 1

Mr. Lee's Donellan Lectures. London: 1854.

ART. II.—Sydney Smith, ... 17

A Memoir of the Rev. Sydney Smith. By his daughter, Lady Holland, with a selection from his Letters. By Mrs. Austin. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1855.

ART. III.—Dr. Henry's Translation of Cousin's Psychology, ... 38

Elements of Psychology: included in a Critical Examination of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, and in Additional Pieces. By Victor Cousin. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by Caleb S. Henry, D. D. Fourth improved Edition, revised according to the Author's last corrections. New York: Ivison & Phinney, 321 Broadway, (successors of Mark H. Newman & Co.) Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 111 Lake Street. Buffalo: Phinney & Co. 1856. Large 12mo. pp. 568.

ART. IV.—The Rule of Christian Offerings, . . . 53

1. The History of Tithes. By I. Selden. London: 1518.
2. An Historical Vindication of the Divine Right of Tithes from Scripture, Reason, and the Opinion and Practice of Jews, Gentiles, and Christians in all ages. Parts I, II. By Thomas Comber, D. D., Precentor of York. London: 1682 and 1685.
3. An Essay concerning the Divine Right of Tithes. By the Rev. Charles Leslie. Works. Vol. VII. Oxford: 1832.
4. Journal of the Seventy-first Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of New York.
5. The Sacerdotal Tithe. By Adam Townley, Presbyter of the Diocese of Toronto, C. W. Pudney & Russell. New York: 1855.
6. The Divine Law of Beneficence. American Tract Society.

ART. V.—Imprisonment and Petition of Bishop Seabury, 73

ART. VI.—American Literature, ... 84

Cyclopædia of American Literature; embracing Personal and Critical Notices of Authors, and Selections from their Writings, from the Earliest Period to the Present Day; with Portraits, Autographs, and other Illustrations. By Evert A. Duyckinck and George L. Duyckinck. In two volumes. 1855. New York: Charles Scribner.

ART. VII.—Western Church Extension Society, . .

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:

Sketches of the Colonial Clergy of Maryland. By Rev. Ethan Allen. No. II. The Rev. William Brogden, Rector of All-Hallow's Parish, Ann Arundel County, 1736; and from 1751, of Queen Anne Parish, Prince George's County, Md. .

ART. VIII.—Book Notices, ...

1. Plain Commentary on the Four Gospels.—2. Macaulay's History of England.—3. Coxe's Impressions of England.—4. Kingsley's Sermons for the Times.—5. Squier's Central America.—6. Review of the Search of Truth.—7. Hallam's Lectures on the Morning Prayer.—8. Goodrich's History of All Nations.—9. Ewbank's Life in Brazil.—10. Monroe's Lecture on Catholicity.—11. Woodworth's Selections from the British Poets.—12. Ingraham's Prince of the House of David.—13. Phelp's Poems.—14. Van Deusen's Christianity in the Republic.—15. Systematic Beneficence.—16. Willis' Our Church Music.—17. Calendar of Trinity College.—18. Gifford's Unison of the Liturgy.—19. Harper's Classical Library.—20. Edith Hale, Wolfsden, Rachel Gray, Kate Weston, Geofrey Moncton.—21. Jarves' Parisian Sights and French Principles.—22. Abbott's History of Hernando Cortez.—23. Harper's Story Books.—24. Flambo.—25. Arthur's Addresses.—26. Church Book Society's Publications.—27. Spencer's History of the United States.—28. Camp's Programme of Themes and Texts.—29. Meyrick's La Santa Chiesa Cattolica, &c.—30. Learning to Think.—31. Spirit of Missions.—32. Croswell's Forty Years in Trinity Parish.—33. Andrews' Work of the Church in America.—34. Coit's Exclusiveness.—35. English Missionary Reports.—36. Bethune's Charge.—37. American Journal of Science and Arts.—38. Littell's Living Age.—39. Facts against Fancy.—40. Arthur's Remarks in S. C. Convention.—41. Pamphlets, Serials, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER:

Summary of Home Intelligence, ...

Summary of Foreign Intelligence, ...

NO. II.

ART. I.—High Church and Low Church, . . .

1. The Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register. New Haven, Ct. 2. The Protestant Episcopal Quarterly Review. New York. 3. The True Catholic. Baltimore, Md. 4. The Southern Episcopalian. Charleston, S. C. 5. The Spirit of Missions. New York. 6. The Churchman's Monthly Magazine. New York. 7. Christian Witness and Church Advocate. Boston, Mass. 8. The Gospel Messenger. Utica, N. Y. 9. The Churchman. New York. 10. The Protestant Churchman. New York. 11. The

Church Journal. New York. 12. The Parish Visitor. New York. 13. The Children's Magazine. New York. 14. The Carrier Dove. New York. 15. The Episcopal Recorder. Philadelphia. 16. Banner of the Cross. Philadelphia. 17. Southern Churchman. Alexandria, Va. 18. The Western Episcopalian. Gambier, Ohio. 19. The Calendar. Hartford, Ct.

ART. II.—Prescott's History of Philip the Second, . 176

History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain. By William H. Prescott, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, etc., etc. Vols. I and II. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

ART. III.—The Church of the New Testament, . . 198

1. The Kingdom of Christ, delineated in two Essays, on our Lord's own account of His Person, and of the Nature of His Kingdom, and of the Constitution, Powers, and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by Himself. By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1843.
2. The Primary Charge, delivered before the Convention, &c., of South Carolina. By the Rt. Rev. Thos. F. Davis, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese. Charleston. 1856.
3. The Church in its Idea, Attributes and Ministry: with a particular reference to the Controversy on the subject between the Romanists and Protestants. By Edward Arthur Litton, M. A., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London, 1851. 8vo. pp. 707.

ART. IV.—Dr. John Esten Cooke, ... 226

ART. V.—The Clergy and the World, ... 244

ART. VI.—Free Seats?—Or Pews? 252

ART. VII.—Book Notices, ... 284

1. Motley's Dutch Republic.—2. Dyce's Table-talk of Samuel Rogers.—3. Appleton's Cyclopædia of Biography.—4. Derby's The Catholic.—5. Watson's Men and Times of the Revolution.—6. Lawrence's Lives of the British Historians.—7. Post's Skeptical Era in Modern History.—8. Helps' Spanish Conquest in America.—9. Sickness—its trials and its blessings.—10. Sketches and Adventures in Madeira, &c.—11. Harper's Classical Library.—12. Madame Pfeiffer's Second Journey Round the World.—13. Strickland's Pioneers of the West. 14.—Beecher's Physiology and Calisthenics.—15. Review of Cyclopædia of American Literature.—16. Abbott's The Teacher.—17. Lowell's Progressive Readers.—18. The Angel in the House.—19. Norton's The Boy who was Trained to be a Clergyman.—20. Lyra Germanica.—21. Butler's Philosophy of the Weather.—22. Romaine's New Age of Gold.—23. Hallam's Sermons.—24. Mayhew's Wonders of Science.—25. Harper's Story Books.—26. Lardners' Thousand and One Things Worth Knowing.—27. Lyra Apostolica.—28. Pamphlets, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER:

Summary of Home Intelligence, ... 299

Summary of Foreign Intelligence, ... 307

NO. III.

ART. I.—Marcion: and his Relation to St. Luke's Gospel, ... 321

1. Tertulliani Opera. Cur. Gersdorf. Leips. 1841.
2. Epiphanii Opera. Paris. 1622.
3. Kritische Untersuchungen, &c. Von Dr. Baur. Tübingen. 1847.
4. Das Nach Apostolisch. Zeitalter. Von Dr. A. Schwegler. Tübingen. 1846.
5. Das Evangelium Marcions. Von A. Ritschl. Tübingen. 1846.
6. Die Evangelien Justins, &c. Von A. Hilgenfeld. Halle. 1850.
7. Das Markus Evangelium. Von Dr Baur. Tübingen. 1851.

ART. II.—Political Preaching, ... 348

The Free and Independent Church. A Discourse delivered in Trinity Church, Cleveland, Ohio, June 15th, 1856. By the Rector, Rev. James H. Bolles, D. D.

Our Country's Troubles; Sermon preached in the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, June 29, 1856. By Rev. Dudley A. Tyng, Rector. Published by request of laymen in Boston;

ART. III.—Cousin and the Princeton Reviewer, . . 358

ART. IV.—Pews and Free Seats, ... 375

ART. V.—The English Puritans, ... 394

1. William H. Seward's Oration at Plymouth Rock, Dec. 24, 1855.
2. Rev. Dr. Zachary Grey's Impartial Examination of Neal's History of the Puritans. Three Vols. London, 1736, 1737, 1739.
3. History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration of Charles II. By M. Guizot. Translated by A. R. Scoble. Two Vols. London: Bentley. 1856.

ART. VI.—The Postscript to the Memorial, . . . 415

To the Rt. Rev. James Hervey Otey, D. D., Bishop of Tennessee, Chairman of a Commission of Bishops, appointed on the Memorial of sundry Presbyters, &c.

ART. VII.—Book Notices, ... 439

1. Conybeare's Perversion.—2. Empie's Sermons.—3. Mrs. Kinzie's Wau-Bun.—4. Turner's Epistle to the Ephesians.—5. Yankee Travels in Cuba.—6. Creasy's Rise and Progress of the English Constitution.—7. The Huguenot Exiles.—8. Wilson's Unitarian Principles confirmed by Trinitarian Testimonies.—9. Bishop Williams' Convention Sermon.—10. Meyrick's Moral Theology of the Church of Rome.—11. Bishop Smith's Fifth Charge.—12. Bishop of Louisiana's Letter to the Bishops of Tennessee, Georgia, &c.—13. Bishop Davis' Primary Charge.—14. Bishop Whittingham's Fourth Charge.—15. Duyckinck's Wit and Wisdom of Sydney Smith.—16. M'Master's Silver Pictures.—17. Romish Tracts.—18. Conant's Sketch, &c., of Adoniram Judson.—19. Wheeler's Life and Travels of Herodotus.—20. Coits' Sermon on Exclusiveness.—21. Coxe's Sermon, Counsels of Unity.—22. Trubner's Bibliographical Guide to American Literature.—23. Law of Liberality among the Denominations, &c.—24. Bremer's Bertha.—25. Appeal in Behalf of Lamartine.—26. Stories and

Lessons on the Festivals, Fasts, &c.—Dr. Bolles' Sermon.—28. Appleton's Railway Guide.—29. Kane's Arctic Explorations.—30. Harper's Story Books.—31. Bishop Burgess' Third Charge.—32. Page's Discourse on the Office of a Deacon.—33. Littlejohn's Address before Convocation.—34. Novels, Pamphlets, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER:

Summary of Home Intelligence, ... 462
Summary of Foreign Intelligence, ... 468

NO. IV.

ART. I.—Dissensions in the Apostolic Age, and their Final Adjustment.—No. I, ... 481

ART. II.—The Rev. James Murdock, D. D., . . 501

ART. III.—The Liturgical Movement, ... 521

1. Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies. Historical Sketches by a Minister of the Presbyterian Church. New York: M. W Dodd. 1855.
2. The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland, or John Knox's Book of Common Order, as prescribed by the General Assembly, and used in the Church of Scotland at and after the Reformation. Edited and carefully revised by the Rev. John Cumming, M. A., Minister of the Scotch Church, Crown Court, Little Russel Street, Covent Garden. London: 1840.
3. Mercersburg Quarterly Review. July, 1856. Art. I.—Liturgical Worship. By a Presbyterian Divine.

ART. IV.—The Unity of Mankind, ... 530

1. The Races of Men; a Fragment. By Robert Knox, M. D. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1850.
2. The London Lancet. For October, November, and December, 1855.
3. The Westminster Review. No. 128. April, 1856. Art. 8.

ART. V.—Rev. Dr. Turner's Letter on the American Bible Society, ... 547

ART. VI.—The Late General Convention, ... 561

Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, 1856. Together with the Constitution and Canons.

ART. VII.—Free Seats, ... 581

ART. VIII.—Book Notices. 604

1. Bowen's Political Economy.—2. Baird's Religion in America.—3. Collot's French Dictionary.—4. Trench's Poems.—5. Magoon's Westward Empire.—6. Stanley's Sinai and Palestine.—7. Shea's Roman Catholic Church in the United States.—8. Oliver's Puritan Commonwealth.—9. Wilson's Western Africa.—10. The Blem-

mertons.—11. Trench's Calderon—12. Loomis's Progress of Astronomy.—13. Hills of Shatemuc.—15 Kip's Double Witness. —15. Strickland's History of American Bible Society.—16. Baird's Modern Greece.—17. Grote's History of Greece.—18. Dehon's Sermons.—19. Book of Common Prayer.—20. Hobart's Clergyman's Companion.—21. De Toqueville's Old Regime.—22. Bunsen's Signs of the Times.—23. Norton's Rockford Parish.—24. Shelton's Peeps from a Belfry.—25. Townley's Sermon.—26. Brownson's Review. —27. Works on Kansas.—28. Lamartine's Celebrated Characters. —29. Harper's School History.—30. Poulterer's Companion.—31. Stowe's Dred.—32. Bonner's Child's History of Rome.— 33. Sunday School Books.—42. Bishop Whitehouse's Address.— Bishop Doane's Address.—35. Harper's Story Books.—36. Letters to a Baptist.—37. Sermons and Reports.—38. Kane's Arctic Explorations.—39. Beaumarchais and his Times.—40. Rome, Christian and Papal.—41. Berrian's Report.—42. Andersson's Lake Ngami.—43. Occasional Papers.—44. Greatorex's Collection of Music.—45. Lord's Andre.—46. Turner's Galatians.—47. Questions on the Evening Lessons.—48. Draper's Physiology.—49. Pamphlets.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER:

Summary of Home Intelligence, ... 628

THE

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. IX. APRIL, 1856. No. 1.

ART. I.—INSPIRATION.

Mr. Lee's Donellan Lectures. London: 1854.

IN continuing from our last Number, the consideration of the important subject of Christian Evidences, we invite the attention of our readers to the question of the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. As we intimated at the conclusion of a former Article, our first object will be "to justify the position we have assigned to this great question, and to show that it does not involve any reasoning in a circle." In doing this, as well as in discussing the subject itself, we shall largely avail ourselves of Mr. Lee's valuable and suggestive Lectures.

Inspiration has been sometimes spoken of, as if it were the primary question between believers and unbelievers. But this we hold to be a palpable error. The Christian Scriptures must first be established as to their genuineness, authenticity, and canonicity, on their own proper grounds of rational evidence, and then, and not till then, is the time to approach the question of their Inspiration. If it were approached sooner, it would involve reasoning in a circle. Because we must go to the Scriptures themselves for our first information, as to the fact of their Inspiration; and we can only escape the charge of a *petitio principii*, by so establishing them on independent grounds of evidence, before we thus go to them, that they become sufficient and unassailable witnesses to themselves, in this respect.

We are not, then, under the circumstances, guilty of the

fallacy so often attributed to Christian advocates, of proving the truth of Scripture by its Inspiration, and the Inspiration of Scripture by itself. Far from it. As we have already seen, the Scriptures rest on their own vast body of testimony; a testimony so varied and so consentient, so beyond all possibility of collusion or artifice, that it approaches as nearly to a demonstration, as any moral evidence ever can. And this being so, we have an entire right to enquire of the Scriptures themselves, under what conditions they were written, and wherein, if in anything, their writers differ from the authors of all other books in the world. There is no reasoning in a circle here. A hundred instances of analogous procedure might be cited, were they needed.

Now, in appealing to the Scriptures for information on this all important subject, we may most properly place ourselves, in the first instance, on the declarations of our Blessed Lord himself. These declarations look two ways. They have regard to the elder Scriptures, and to those also of the New Testament; to the former, in the way of recognition, to the latter, in the way of promise. And therefore, as regards the fact of the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, they may be fairly considered as covering the whole ground. It is, however, with their latter aspect only, that we are here concerned.

There were, then, four distinct occasions, on which, before his death, our Lord promised to his Disciples the aid of the Holy Spirit. And these four promises are arranged very judiciously, by Mr. Lee, in two classes. In the first are to be placed the three found respectively in St. Matthew x, 19, 20; St. Luke xii, 11, 12; and St. Mark xiii, 11, with which is also to be taken St. Luke xxi, 14, 15. In all these passages there is distinctly promised an objective, positive, external influence of the Holy Spirit, on "all the public occasions on which the Apostles could be called upon to defend themselves, whether before Councils or Synagogues, before Governors or Kings." And that this promise was fulfilled to the Apostles, is made so evident by the course of the subsequent narrative of their acts and words, that even such writers as Paulus and Strauss are compelled virtually to admit it. The words of Paulus are too remarkable to be passed without notice. "If," he says, "we embrace in historic glance the record of the origin of Christianity, from the last evening of the life of Jesus, to the close of the fifty days next following, it is undeniable that, in that short interval, something of a nature encouraging beyond what was ordinary, must have taken place, to transform the trembling and irresolute Apostles of that evening into men ex-

alted above all fear of death, who could exclaim before the embittered judges of the murdered Jesus, 'We must obey God rather than men.'"

In the second class are to be placed the very remarkable promise or promises, contained in the fourteenth and following chapters of the Gospel of St. John. This promise demands a careful analysis. It will be found to be twofold, though it grounds itself on the assurance, that when the Lord has gone away from his Apostles, he will send to them—and here again an objective external influence is pledged to them—the Holy Ghost, here described as the "Spirit of Truth." He is (1) to recall to their minds whatever the Lord has declared to them, and (2) to teach them all things.* For this great gift they have been prepared, by having been the companions of their Lord, while he abode on earth: and by it, and in it, old truths which they have learned from him, are to be brought back to their recollection, and new truth is to be imparted from above.

We can hardly fail to observe, that our Lord here recognizes that distinction to which in a former Article we alluded; the distinction, namely, between what have been called the human and the divine elements in the Scriptures. For here are obviously set forth two sorts of truths; one which the Apostles already knew, and another which they did not know. The former the Spirit is to recall, the latter, He is to communicate. And thus the Redeemer's promise expresses precisely the conditions, under which reason would teach us *a priori*, if the Spirit were to be given, at all, it must be given to be effectual and sufficient for the purpose had in view. The former truths had already been directly declared to the Apostles by our Lord; the latter were to be declared to them from Him, by the vicarial agency of the Holy Ghost. He was all along the Revealer; the Inspiring Spirit brought back what He had already taught, or what the Apostles had already seen, and communicated what, as yet, Christ had not taught them, the many things which He had to say to them, but which they were not then able to bear.†

Now it seems very clear upon examining the two promises of our Lord, that there is between them an important difference. The first, recorded in the Synoptical Gospels, relates to special personal exigencies, in which the Apostles were told they would be placed, and in which, as matter of fact, we find they were placed. The promise, therefore, is, so to speak, personal to themselves; intended for their personal encouragement, support, and consolation, when they should stand before

* St. John xiv, 25, 26. † St. John xvi, 12, 13.

Jewish Sanhedrims or Roman Tribunals. But the latter, recorded by St. John, presents no such limitations or restrictions. The truths recalled to their recollections, or directly communicated, by the Spirit, constitute that Gospel which they are to preach to every creature, either by word or writing. And hence it is plain, that even if the first promises have reference to the *words* which the Apostles were to speak before Kings and Rulers in the name of Christ, the latter cannot be so restricted; so that the foolish distinction—a distinction, let it be observed, which the Apostles nowhere recognize—between their oral teaching and their written instruction, comes to nothing, and may be summarily dismissed.

The Apostolic History is a continuous comment on, and verification of, the Lord's first promise. A transformation of the whole nature of the Apostles seems to have followed Christ's Ascension, analogous to that described in the words of Samuel to Saul: "The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt be turned into another man." We find these poor fishermen of Galilee, whose whole tone of thought and line of conduct before their Lord's departure had remained so true to the character of "unlearned, ignorant men," changed on a sudden into the courageous rivals of the philosophers and rhetoricians of their age. We see them, at first, restless from doubts, and fettered by prejudices, now immovable in their convictions, and alive to each new aspect of the truth. Formerly timid and wavering, they now are fearless and resolved. Their delusive dream of temporal deliverance becomes a real assurance of eternal Redemption. Their narrow estimate of the divine covenant with their nation expands, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, into the sublime conception of the "Israel of God." Nor do the Apostolic history and the Apostolic writings any less explain and indicate the second fuller and less restricted promise of Christ. The Apostles distinctly claim that the Holy Ghost *and* they, are witnesses to Christ, not independent witnesses, but He witnessing through them.* They put themselves on the same ground with "those holy men of old" who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."† They reject and even anathematize man or angel, who shall declare any other doctrine than theirs;‡ and this doctrine they never pretend to have discovered by the use of their own reason, but they always refer it to the gift of God, and the illumination of the Spirit.§ While if any one should be inclined to fancy that all this relates to the teachings by word,

* Acts v, 32. † Eph. ii, 20; 2 Peter iii, 2. ‡ Gal. i, 8. § Eph. iii, 5.

and not by the written instructions of the Apostles, St. John's assertion concerning his Gospel, "These *are written* that ye might believe," and St. Paul's exhortation to the Thessalonians, to hold fast to what they had been taught by word or *by Epistle*,* ought to show that no such distinctions existed in the minds of the Apostles. But, indeed, reason itself, if rightly directed, leads to the conclusion that such a distinction is as groundless as it is perverse. And, finally, this Divine guidance is asserted to extend to the very language of the Apostolic instructions.†

Thus broadly and fully, then, was the guidance of the Holy Spirit, call it Inspiration or what you choose, promised by our Lord to His Apostles, to furnish them what they were to say in all their witnessings to Him at every time, and in every place; to recall to their minds His acts, His words, His divine instructions; and to communicate to them such truths as were before unknown; words, instructions, truths, which were to form that precious heritage, committed to the Church, to make men "wise unto salvation." Thus fully does the Apostolic History verify these gracious promises. Thus fully do the Apostles claim and appropriate them, in all their completeness and integrity.

And now, the sole objection against all this, alleged from the New Testament, is grounded on certain passages in the seventh Chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians.‡ The objection is, that in this Chapter, the Apostle distinguishes between what he says by Inspiration, and what he says by himself; and the conclusion is, that some parts of the Epistles are inspired, and some are not; whence, as Mr. Greg shrewdly argues, it follows, that "every man must judge for himself, *which are which*,—must separate by his own skill the divine from the human assertions in the Bible." Were this really so, we certainly might as well give up the whole thing at once. But let us proceed to examine the Chapter, by the aid of Mr. Lee and the writers to whom he refers.

The first five verses contain certain directions to husbands and wives in reference to a matter of mutual duty. Then, in the sixth verse, according to our English version, the Apostle says, "But I speak this *by permission* and not *of commandment*." There is no real difficulty here. The apparent one, arises from the ambiguity of our word permission. Had the

* St. John xx, 31; 2 Thess. ii, 15. † 1 Cor. ii, 13; 1 Thess. ii, 13.

‡ For it is not worth while to notice the objections arising from unreasonable expositions of Rom. vi, 18, 19, and 2 Cor. xi, 16, 17. Mr. Alford, as quoted by Mr. Lee, fully explains these passages.

better word *indulgence*, or *allowance* been employed, the meaning of the passage would have been unequivocally presented, namely, I say this by way of allowance *for* you, not of command *to* you.

In the tenth and eleventh verses, the Apostle discusses the Law of Marriage, introducing his decision with the words, "And unto the married I command, yet not I but the Lord." Now the idea is, that in this passage he distinguished between his *own* commands, and those received by revelation from Christ. But this is not so. He is, says Mr. Alford, "about to give them a command resting not merely on *inspired Apostolic authority*, great and undoubted as that was, but on that of the Lord Himself,* so that all supposed distinction between the Apostle when writing of *himself* and *of the Lord*, is quite irrelevant." In other words, he is re-stating a command which our Lord gave while he abode on earth, and the contrast lies simply between that, and what he, as an Inspired Apostle, might give; not between different commands of his own, given at different times, and under different conditions. Meyer and even DeWette are obliged to admit this; and the former says, "He . . . distinguishes here, not between his own and inspired commands, but between those which proceed from his own inspired subjectivity, and those which Christ maintained by his objective word." This passage, then, affords no real ground for the objection.

But still, it is urged, in verses twelfth and twenty-fifth, the Apostle says, "To the rest speak I, not the Lord," and again, "I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment." Now, in the first of these passages, he is speaking of marriage, where one of the parties is an unbeliever, and in the second, he is giving directions concerning virgins; and by the language he employs, "he is supposed to intimate that, in certain parts of Scripture, the author may write according to his own uninspired human judgment, although guided in other portions of his work, by the Holy Ghost." But the fallacy lies in supposing that the expression, "the commandment of the Lord," means a communication made by the Holy Ghost to the Apostle; whereas it merely signifies an express direction of Christ, given while He abode on earth, and which had now become *historical*. So that again, the Apostle is not here contrasting what he says by the Spirit, and what he says of himself, but what he says reiterating already expressed commands of Christ, and what he says by the Spirit, in reference to cases, of which,—

* The command of Christ, is in St. Mark x, 12.

since they did not then exist,—our Lord had not, while He was on earth, spoken. Thus, Olshausen well remarks: "We find that the Apostle distinguishes between what he says, and what the Lord says; between a definite command of Christ, (ἐπιταγή,) and his own subjective judgment, (γνώμη) . . . Suppose, therefore, that Paul had no traditional command of Christ upon a certain subject; yet we must esteem his *inspired conviction* as equivalent to such a command, for Christ wrought in him by His Spirit."

In all these three cases, then,—and they form the whole foundation of the objection under consideration,—the Apostle is contrasting, not his own condition of Inspiration at one time, and non-Inspiration at another; but, express commands of our Lord delivered while He was yet on earth, "appropriated and recalled by the assistance of the Spirit," and the inward suggestions of the Holy Ghost, by which He was guided in the work of His Apostolate. In the first case, he declares that he is not uttering one of these inward suggestions, but is recalling and reiterating a law once spoken by our Lord's own lips. In the last two cases, he declares, that he is not recalling and reiterating such a law, but is giving utterance to these inward suggestions. Still, in each and every case, he is under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, he speaks as an Inspired Apostle. In the first, the Spirit is fulfilling one part of our Lord's twofold promise in St. John, that He should bring all things to the remembrance of the Apostles, which Christ had said. In the last two, he is fulfilling the other part of the same promise, that he should teach them all things and guide them into all truth. The objection, therefore, falls; and the witness which the New Testament Scriptures has to the Inspiration of their authors, is untouched, consentient, and complete.

Such being the testimony of the Scriptures themselves, we may next proceed to enquire, did the Universal Church receive the Scriptures in accordance with that testimony, and so continue and carry it on? In answering this question, it is necessary to observe, that we are not to look in the early ages for "any elaborate theory, or series of systematized propositions on the subject of Inspiration." The very nature of the case forbids us to expect anything of the kind. "Distance," says Mr. Westcott,* "is a necessary condition, if we are to estimate rightly any object of vast proportions." And the very living

* In his General Survey of the New Testament Canon; a work which forms one of the invaluable Series of Theological Manuals, now in course of publication at Cambridge,—*not* in New England.

consciousness of the Christian body, the very fulness of its gifts and life, while it prevented men in that age from fully realizing that the then forming Canon, contained all that the Church could ever need, forbade them also, to undertake a dogmatic teaching on Inspiration, which the very harmony of opinion rendered needless. But they do make just that distinction between the New Testament Scriptures and their own or other writings, which affords the most valuable proof for our purposes; a proof which, if it were more systematized and dogmatic, might well, by every rule of Historical criticism, be regarded with suspicion. While the very absence "of recognized theory or system, serves but to exhibit in bolder relief how profoundly incorporated with the Christian consciousness of those times, was the belief in the Inspiration of Scripture; and undesignedly represents its depth, its fervor, and its source."

Time and space alike forbid us to attempt to exhibit the testimony of the Church to the Inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures* in detail. We can only refer our readers to the elaborate Appendix of Mr. Lee on the "Judgment of the Fathers;" where the testimony is drawn out at length, with a minuteness and care, which render this one of the most valuable portions of his work. The result alone can be briefly stated. The line is unbroken from Clement of Rome to Augustine, and farther it is not necessary to follow it out; and the voices multiply as time goes on. Through the age immediately following the Apostles, through that of the Greek Apologists, when Christianity was no longer a work of silence but of strength, when it conquered the intellect as well as the heart, through the Diocletian persecution, far into the Conciliar age, the line extends. From the great centres of Christendom, from Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus and Rome, from East and West alike, the witnesses come forth. And while their witness varies endlessly in form, and is accompanied with unnumbered illustrations, still for substance it is all the same. It echoes and continues the witness of the Scriptures themselves, that they who wrote them, wrote them by the Spirit of God. There is a unanimity in the testimony that can only be accounted for by its truth.

And yet, withal, there is just enough of exception to the unanimity, to bring it out in bolder relief, and present it with greater distinctness. There are the possible denials of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the undoubted ones of the Anomœans. Mr.

* The mention of the New Testament is not intended to imply that there is not the same testimony to the Old. It alone is named, because it alone is here under consideration.

Lee certainly makes the case of Theodore more than doubtful. That of the Anomœans, in the fourth century, he does not question. But the indignant manner in which their assertion that here "the Apostle spake as a man," is treated as a thing before unheard of, proves that they were herein only denying the consentient belief of the Church. It is a case, where, most strikingly, the single exception proves the rule. And now we will sum up this testimony of the Church, in the eloquent words of Mr. Lee, feeling that no apology is requisite for the length of our extract. "This belief was no merely speculative tenet; nor did it rest upon some general feeling that the writings which taught the doctrines of revealed religion were deserving of reverence. Their conviction of the divine source of that faith which the Bible unfolds, was not more firm than their conviction that the origin of the records which contain its history was, in like manner, divine. Proofs, equally incontrovertible, were given of both. The soldier of the Cross, in our day, goes forth to heathen lands, supported, it is true, by the sense of duty, and animated by his glorious message: but he is also cheered on his path, and stimulated in his toil,—for he is but man,—by the consciousness of universal sympathy, and the tokens of public applause. Once this was not so. There were days when the Christian missionary, although in the land of his fathers, and surrounded by the civilization of the world, was encountered on every side, did he suffer his thoughts to dwell upon aught but the task before him, by the certainty of persecution, and contumely, and wrong. 'If the Tiber,' says Tertullian, 'floods to the walls, if the Nile does not irrigate the fields, if the heavens are shut, if the earth quakes, if there is a famine or a pestilence,—at once the cry is raised, CHRISTIANOS AD LEONEM.' In attestation of the truth and origin of the facts on which Christianity relies, no more convincing proof can be alleged than the endurance of such trials, and the triumphs thus achieved. The proof, too, is one of which Christian Apologists in every age have not been slow to avail themselves. But the argument should not pause here. It exhibits the Church's belief in the divine character and inspiration of the Bible, no less than in the truth and heavenly origin of its contents. Jew and Christian alike were eager to sacrifice life itself, not merely in defense of the doctrines of revealed religion, but of the very documents in which those doctrines were contained. Within so short a space of time as ten years before the public recognition of Christianity, the persecution of Diocletian carried torture and death to every section of the Church. The trial of the martyr's faith was not now to sacrifice to the

gods, or to adore the Emperor;—the edict went forth, 'Give up your sacred writings, or die.' There was no longer that actual knowledge of the facts of Christ's life, or of the teaching of His Apostles, which had cheered the martyr Stephen, and supported the dying Polycarp. The personal recollection of such matters had now ceased; the belief in the facts had become, as with us, but historical: and yet such was the firm conviction of the divine inspiration and heavenly origin of the Scriptures of Truth, that death with all its horrors was embraced, rather than resign them to the heathen. To use the profound observation of Pascal: 'This is a sincerity which has no example in the world, nor its root in nature.' "

Thus, then, the matter stands as to the Divine origination, or Inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures. We find the genuineness, the authenticity, the credibility of those Scriptures established by a mass of rational evidence, such as pertains to nothing else: thus established, these same Scriptures, alike in the promises of Him on whom they rest, and by the recorded lives and words of those whom He commissioned to speak and write His truth, testify to their having done both under the guidance of the Holy Ghost; and this claim is admitted by those to whom their words first, and then their writings, came, and it is carried on and continued, as the *Immemorial Doctrine of the Church of God.* Well, then, may a late writer say, "When the Church is asked for her proofs of the Divine authority of the Scriptures, her first word is—Testimony; her second word is—Testimony; and her third word is—Testimony."* And if this testimony is rejected, then with it, all historical belief of every kind, and relating to everything, must be abandoned.

Thus far, we have been concerned with the *fact* of the Inspiration of the New Testament writers; we now approach a subject which requires great delicacy of handling, and where there is much room for misapprehension, the *theory* of Inspiration; that is, in other words, the inquiry how the Holy Spirit acted upon those who wrote. Here Holy Scripture is silent, and doubtless it had been better if men had followed its example; if they had contented themselves with the fact, and attempted no analysis or explanation of what, in the very nature of things, must be a profound mystery. For apart from some

* Of course, this is not intended to exclude the inward witness of the Holy Ghost, setting the final seal in individual cases; and lifting the teachings of the Holy Scriptures out of the regions of human testimony, into those of Divine assurance. But this follows on, and completes the work now under consideration.

specific reasons which we shall have occasion to notice further on, for the multiplication of theories of Inspiration in modern times, the very fact of dwelling on and resting in any theory at all, is an indication of the decline of a living faith in, and conscious appropriation of, the thing. And, therefore, it is an evil. Still, men have theorized, and men will theorize, about Inspiration; and, therefore, the present view of the subject would be even more imperfect than it is, were all consideration of this theorizing to be omitted.

Before, however, we proceed to speak of it, we must premise three important considerations; which, if they are borne in mind, we cannot but think will do much to render theorizing on this mysterious subject harmless.

First, then, it must be in the nature of things, that no theory can explain Inspiration. It may say what it is not,—just as in the Creed we can guard against denials of the Faith,—but it can no more adequately explain what it is, than in the same Creed, or in any other symbolical determination, we can adequately explain a mystery of the Faith. Here, we think, is the great ψευδος of Mr. Lee's volume: which, while it is in many respects exceedingly valuable, is of very litle value in the line which he had in view; in fact, not accomplishing what he proposed, imply because it cannot be accomplished.

Secondly, the failure of any theory to account for the phenomena of the case, makes only against the theory itself, and not against the fact of Inspiration. This is nothing more than a corollary from the preceding proposition, if indeed it is not rather a re-statement of it under another aspect. It is merely the application to the matter in hand, of a principle admitted, and familiar in science, on which it cannot be necessary to enlarge.

Thirdly, it results from this obvious distinction between the fact of Inspiration and any theory about it, that *no theory* has any right to claim such predominance and certainty for itself, as that the denial of it can be regarded as the denial of Inspiration. The fact is divine, the theory is human. And however much one may be persuaded of its soundness, and its logical cohesion, still it is a human theory after all. The Scriptures set forth no theory of Inspiration; they leave men to construct such a theory, if they *will* have one, by logical deductions from, and rational analysis and synthesis of, the language in which they state the fact. Neither has the Catholic Church, or any one of its branches, adopted into its Creeds, or Symbolical collections, any theory so deduced and framed. The matter, then, is left to individuals, strictly and distinctly.

And he who shall be so in love with his theory, as to confound it with its underlying fact, and to denounce him who does not accept it, as an unbeliever in Inspiration, has pushed his possibly allowable self-complacency into a piece of insufferable self-righteousness. This is Popery in all its essential abomination.

We have passed, then, out of the region of Divine truth in regard to Inspiration, and have entered on that of human speculation. We have no Scriptures, no Creed, no Symbol, no Confession to appeal to in the way of a formal statement. We are concerned with the reasonings and opinions of individual men. In considering these, it is but natural that we should go first to the early Church. But in regard to this, we have already noticed the singular absence of theory which it presents. There is nothing systematized and arranged. The nearest that the early Doctors approach to any theory, is when they employ that favorite comparison, in which they represent the Inspired writers as musical instruments played upon by the Spirit; a comparison "obviously suggested by the primary sense of the word Spirit." And yet we can more readily find what they did *not* mean by this comparison, than what,—approaching to a theory,—they did intend to express by it. For there were two systems into contact with which they were brought, and whose false claims in the matter of Inspiration, they were obliged to expose. These were, Heathenism on the one side, and Montanism on the other. Both systems agreed in their views of Inspiration. The μάντις of Heathenism and the Prophet of Montanism, both were supposed to lose their individual consciousness, and to be in a state of unconscious ecstasy; that is, they became mere automatical machines under the inspiring influence. Now, this very idea of a state of unconsciousness, is urged by the Christian orthodox opponents of these two systems, as proof that their Inspirations could not proceed from the Holy Ghost.* And whatever may be the logical value of the argument, it at least shows,—and we adduce it for this purpose only,—that the Inspired Christian writers were not believed to be unconscious machines; that whatever the comparison alluded to, meant, it did not mean this; and that the Fathers who from the time of Justin Martyr employ it, and many of whom were the opponents alike of

* The only instances when Inspiration is believed by the Fathers to consist with the unconsciousness of the person inspired, are such cases as Balaam and Caiaphas, whose unworthiness made this distinction between them and the Sacred writers. But this only brings out more clearly the view here insisted on.

Heathenism and Montanism, recognized in the Inspiration of the New Testament writers, the coëxistence of Divine and Human agencies, the coöperation of the Human and the Divine Intelligence. And thus much seems to be all, or nearly all, that we can collect in the way of a Theory of Inspiration, down to the period of the Reformation. The Fathers seem to have mainly contented themselves with the fact; which they rested first on the testimony of the Scriptures; next on the continuous and unbroken testimony of the Church; and lastly, for individuals, on the internal witness in the believer's soul, of the same Holy Spirit which inspired the Apostles.

Still, as time went on, influences were coming to bear on all these grounds of belief in the Inspiration of the Scriptures, which tended to lead men unduly to value theories of Inspiration; and which doubtless did lead to the variety of theories which since the middle of the sixteenth century have from time to time arisen. To begin with, Scripture itself was greatly out of sight for a long period antedating the Reformation, and its testimony in this, as in other matters, was in a good degree unknown. The *testimony* of the continuous Church, was supplanted by the *authority* of the *existing* Church. While the responsibilities and the position of the individual Christian, together with his individual relation to the Holy Spirit, were to a great extent lost, in that merging of the individual in the whole corporate Christian body, into which the precious doctrine of membership in the Church of Christ had been corrupted. It is obvious, therefore, that every element of that foundation, on which the early Church rested her belief in the fact of Inspiration, was either perverted or obscured. At this juncture, the Reformation came; we speak now, not of England, but of the Continent of Europe. The Scriptures were restored. The doctrine of the individual internal witness was restored—for, in fact, the corporate existence of the Christian was soon almost as much ignored as his individuality had been. Two elements of the old foundation were in men's hands. But it was *not* seen, that there was any difference between the testimony of the continuous Churches and the authority of the existing Church; so that both were rejected together. And then, to fill the gap thus left between, the external testimony of Scripture itself, and the inward witnessing of the Spirit, theories of Inspiration were devised, which thus took the place of the testimony of the Church. England was, at least partially, an exception to this course of things. There, the testimony of the continuous Church was recognized as a different thing from the authority of the ex-

isting Church. The Church of England, therefore, has contented herself with doing what the early Church did, namely, asserting the fact of Inspiration, without meddling with its theory. While theories themselves have rarely, if ever, originated in her, but have been introduced from outside, as suited the wants or views of those who have brought them in.

Now, we confess, all these considerations, cause us to take small interest in theories of Inspiration. Those who are interested in them, will find much curious information, and many suggestive thoughts, in Mr. Lee's Lectures, the great fault of which, as we have already intimated, seems to us to be, that a great deal too much importance is assigned in them to theory, as compared with fact. God help us, if our faith in the Inspiration of his Holy Word is to be dependent on the construction of a satisfactory and exhaustive theory about it, by the fallible intellect of man! It is a mischievous error to suppose it; an error fraught with fatal consequences. For what theory, however cleverly contrived, can man devise, in which some more clever theory-monger cannot pick flaws, and point out defects and inconsistencies? And then, at once, the cry is raised, that the Inspiration of the Scriptures is disproved! But it is not so. All the theories as to how the Apostles were inspired, that ever have been, or that ever shall be, might be scattered to the four winds of heaven, and the fact of the Inspiration of the Scriptures, would still remain untouched. That rests on a basis, stronger than man's theories; on the promise of Christ; the witness of the Scriptures themselves; the witness of the continuous Church; the witness of the Holy Ghost lifting man from the regions of earthly testimony, into those of a heavenly assurance, changing the persuasions of human witnessing, into the certainties of divine attestation. And while theories vanish in endless succession, this is a foundation which neither man nor devil can destroy.

Still, there are certain accessory facts, which any theory of Inspiration is bound to recognize, and incorporate into itself. So that the right to theorize cannot be regarded as unlimited and unrestrained. And having stated these, we shall tax the attention of our readers no further.

First, the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration, must be kept in view. The merest glance at the Holy Scriptures shows, that there are contained in them some facts and truths which the human mind itself can arrive at by its ordinary processes, and means of obtaining knowledge; and others which can only be known by a supernatural communication. The latter alone, belong to Revelation, but Inspiration

deals with both. "By Revelation we understand a direct communication from God to man, either of such knowledge as man could not of himself attain to, because its subject matter transcends human sagacity, or human reason,—or which (although it might have been attained in the ordinary way) was not, in point of fact, from whatever cause known to the person who received the Revelation. By Inspiration, on the other hand, we understand that actuating energy of the Holy Spirit, guided by which the human agents chosen by God, have officially proclaimed His will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible."

Secondly, the fact must be recognized, that in the work of Inspiration, two distinct elements coöperate with each other; namely, the Spirit of God, and the human intelligence. And it cannot be permitted, that one of these shall be regarded as absorbing and nullifying the other.

Thirdly, it must be admitted that all the New Testament is inspired.* The only alleged Scriptural ground for denying this, has already been considered, and shown to be unreal and futile. While the indignant way in which the notions of the Anomœans were denied, shows that the early Church knew no such idea as they entertained, that the Apostles spoke at one time as men, and at another by Inspiration. The notion bears absurdity on its very face, and its ultimate issues can only produce infidelity.

If these subordinate facts are kept in view, we see no reason why those who wish to theorize, on this subject, so mysterious, —and so much more a subject for devout thankfulness and meditation, than for discussion and analysis,—may not be permitted to do so, to their heart's content; provided always, they will remember that their theories are human speculations, and that the *fact* of Inspiration, is the Truth of God.

We feel bound to add a few words in reference to the volume which stands at the head of this Article, and of the materials and suggestions furnished by which, we have so largely availed ourselves. This underlying fault, we have already indicated: the idea, namely, that some satisfactory theory of Inspiration must be devised, and the apparent acquiescence in the conclusion, that, unless one can be devised, the doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures must be given up. This false notion colors, and at the same time cramps the whole

* We speak of the New Testament only, because that alone is here under consideration: not because there is any difference in this respect between it and the elder Scriptures.

work; it leads to an unscientific arrrangement of materials, a occasional want of sharp definiteness in statement, from fear, would seem, that some of the corners of the theory may chipped off.

Still, we do not hesitate to say, that Mr. Lee's volume vastly in advance of any work we have on the subject; that furnishes an immense amount of the most valuable facts a suggestions; that it is singularly calm and uncontroversia that it will be better liked on the second reading than on t first, and on the third than either; and that the theory whi he defends,—we protest against its name "dynamic," as an i tolerable cross between German and Yankee,—is less liable objection than any with which we are acquainted. But as h already been urged, the construction of a complete and e haustive theory of Inspiration, is a simple impossibility.

Art. II.—SYDNEY SMITH.

A Memoir of the Reverend Sydney Smith. By his daughter, Lady Holland, with a selection from his Letters. By Mrs. Austin. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1855.

Talent does not always descend in families, nor is it an inheritance which is governed by the laws of primogeniture. In the work before us, which is the tribute of a daughter to the memory of a distinguished man, her father, there are combined with an intimate knowledge and appreciation, so essential, a compactness of style and a directness of purpose, as if the pen which wrote had been dipped in the Sydnean ink-stand. It is a fortunate coincidence that the one to whom the task naturally fell, and who alone possessed the requisite materials, was so admirably qualified to make use of them to the best advantage. Coming timidly to the work, Lady Holland has succeeded in the most difficult and delightful species of composition, and has enriched the language with a genuine biography. She has imparted to her narrative the charm that attached to a life which was without remarkable incident, yet full of import; she has enabled us to form an idea at once distinct and satisfactory of the moral lineaments of one who acted no mean part in his own day and generation, and though he neither wore a mitre, nor lifted up his voice in Senates, nor was placed at the helm of government, had power to direct discordant elements by his enchanting wand. She has thus been enabled to correct erroneous impressions, to present the truth in clear and vivid colors, and while satisfying the just expectations of the world, to fulfill the dearest obligation which filial gratitude could pay.

If the materials which make up this modest work had been increased ten-fold by the imperturbable purpose, the dancing attendance, and short-hand propensities of a Boswell, although our pleasure might have been protracted, it is doubtful if our knowledge could have been enhanced. We can form an ultimate judgment from the types which have been preserved as well as from an accurate recital of all the multifarious things which he said and did. At all events, the portrait stands from the canvas fairly. Eloquence and essential wit escape from the lips. It speaks with a life-like fidelity of limning. It is

not the picture of a clergyman in gown and cassock, nor of a mere wit, whose distinctive trait is apparent at the mouth-corners, but of one in whom divers qualities, rarely found in conjunction, were remarkably blended—in short, of plain Sydney Smith. Indeed, such a work was at this time needed to make one understand the symmetry of a character which had been somewhat distorted to our view by the very brilliancy of its parts: in which the salient points and projections are softened down by the completeness of the whole; where the commonest acts of every day life are shown subordinate to some settled purpose, and where, however different may be the stand-point from which men look upon certain questions, we must at least acknowledge the conduct of one swayed by honest convictions, and however erring, at least consistent with himself. In this country, where our ignorance of English contemporaneous affairs is not so blissful as it might be, and we know that London is on the Thames, we have had an imperfect idea of the real strength and solidity involved in the character of Sydney Smith. Had he adopted a profession more congenial to the play of his peculiar abilities, instead of one which, but for the force of his propensity, would have modified them too much, or put them under a perpetual interdict; had he been brought into directer and more visible contact with those social evils against which he battled his life long, instead of preaching sermons in St. Paul's, or scattering his darts from the Scottish Olympus; had he been even on the strong side of politics and elevated to a position where his living voice could have been heard, we should have seen where the lightnings flashed and where the bolts descended. We might have known him sooner, if not better. But as it was, his influence, though as surely felt, was insensibly absorbed into the English mind; his ameliorating ideas percolated gradually through the mass, and only now we begin to trace back certain effects and assign a share of the cause to one whom, perhaps, we had only known as the author of witty sayings.

We had been apt to think of him as a very queer man both outwardly and mentally; that he probably wore a hat as remarkable as that which Lady Holland describes as belonging to that "picturesque old man," her grandfather, (whom she lovingly speaks of as very clever, odd by nature, but still more so by design,) and that his other vestments matched the hat; that his behavior was full of angularities, and that those who passed him would be likely to stare, and to cry out, "*Hic ille!* There goes Sydney Smith!"—that he was a Laurence Sterne, or a Dean Swift *redivivus*, whose secular side was the

most notable, and who had small regard for clerical etiquette. Now and then a flash of his wit reached us, stretching like a long ray of undulating light from some brilliant star across the Atlantic. True genius must sweep in an eccentric orbit, regulated by no ordinary laws which have been deduced, but we do not find in these volumes that he was odd for the sake of oddity. If he invented a catapult when a half-starved boy at school, it was for the utilitarian purpose of capturing a stray turkey; or a cow-scratcher when he turned farmer, it was because cattle have no hands, while scratching is a great luxury; or a grotesque coach for his family to ride in, it was for the sake of comfort, and because he could not afford a better. Some years ago, however, the republication of his Reviews revealed his earnest intentions and drift, but we could not from these separate parts, arrange the mental anatomy of the man. We remember to have been irresistibly attracted by the original way in which he waged war against all hoary abuses; to have been edified by his commentaries upon the game-laws, and the serious, comical way in which he set forth the evil tendencies of Methodism, and to have laughed without compunction at the expense of the Baptist missionaries. That savage repast spread upon a New Zealand sideboard, composed of evangelical hearts, titbits mustarded with a ferocious appetite, and sandwiches of cold missionary, made us cachinnate heartily, in spite of ourselves, with a ghoul-like glee. We were over-dazzled by the method and manner of his sharp wit. He had "such a way of putting things!"

In after years came the picture of Mrs. Partington sweeping out the Atlantic Ocean from her door with a mop, which kept us in a good humor, until he suddenly drew in his scattered forces and launched them all in one scathing and unexpected invective against the insolvent Jonathan, who laughed dismally on the other side of his mouth. He cauterized the skin of the repudiating confederations to the very quick. As the Philadelphia Quaker in Chestnut street read his morning newspaper containing the foreign news and the last letter of Sydney Smith, his hot roll fell from his hands, he was scandalized to find that honesty, the badge of all his tribe, should thus publicly be brought into disrepute in its very citadel; his placidity of face was ruffled, and he launched out the terrible and grammatical anathema—"Friend Sydney, thee does not do us justice." It is strange what prodigous effects can be produced by a few scratches of a pliant nib! From the bay of Fundy to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the broom-swept Atlantic to the Yellow Mississippi, there was a palpable sensation, a squirm

like that caused by a sudden puncture. The Press flamed with vindictive and vindicatory paragraphs, and Jonathan was as mad as a March hare. Whatever may have been our impressions, we shall be enabled by this work to correct our reckoning, and by its admirable delineation, which, if it proceeded from duty, has done simple justice, to form an estimate which will be nearly true. Good biographies have been scarce, and, unfortunately, the stock of great men appears to be dwindling, which would make them necessary. The letters and scattered writings of noted persons have latterly been strung together by those on whom the duty devolved, with some little reference to dates, and some preliminary essay, with some few links and slovenly commentaries, the whole accomplished as something which the public would look for, but without particular merit of performance. So rare a conjunction can scarcely be expected to occur again as that which presented to our view the great Johnson with his attendant Satellite, and caused them to converse together for so long a time over the immense gulf of contempt.

We will add one word about the letters contained in the second volume. These have been arranged and edited by Mrs. Austin without note or comment, yet with tact and delicacy, and they serve to fill up some chasms, to illustrate many traits, and enhance the value of the work. The principles by which she has been guided are such as she justly remarks, can alone justify the publication of private letters; that they shall "neither hurt the living, injure the dead, nor impair the reputation of the writer." Yet, in spite of her care, we conceive that there may be some few allusions remaining which might give a twinge of uneasiness, although they can inflict no serious hurt. The familiar correspondence of some noted men has no doubt been quaintly and cunningly devised with a view to ultimate publicity, but what a Janus-faced look would sincerity have if the seals still sticking to ordinary letters could be torn away, and they should be given in one batch to the world. For even if they were not rich like those of Horace Walpole in talk and scandal, they would need, like those, to be kept "in wood" a hundred years, before their sharpness would evaporate, when they would not set the tongue a wagging and only serve to enliven the 'heart of man.' These, however, are sincere and manly. We are thankful for the privilege of reading them, and that they have not been lost, destroyed, or without taking us on the way, transmitted to distant posterity.

Sydney Smith was born at Woodford, in Essex, in 1771, of a family remarkable for their talents. From Southampton, where

e received the first rudiments of education, he was sent with is youngest brother to the foundation at Winchester, where he xperienced that brutality of treatment which still clings to the nglish system, if boys are still "booked, fed, clothed," and hipped at Dothboy's Hall, if fagging has not gone into dis-se, and if treacle is not abolished. Such training may be a seful ordeal for the stout and brave like himself, but we uestion the morality of crushing the life out of weak infants. Here he manufactured ten thousand Latin verses, and his choolfellows signed a round-robin refusing to try for the Col-ege prizes if the Smiths were allowed to contend for them any nore, as they always gained them. Soon after quitting Win-hester he was sent to Mont Villiers, in Normandy, to perfect is knowledge of French, and here, for the sake of safety, it as thought necessary that he should enrol himself in one of he Jacobin Clubs as Le Citoyen Smit, Membre affilié au Club es Jacobins de Mont Villiers. His next remove was to New ollege, Oxford, where, by virtue of his proficiency at Win-hester, he was entitled to a scholarship, and afterwards to a ellowship. At this time his inclination would have led him to he bar, but yielding afterwards to his father's wishes he was induced to enter the Church. We do not regard that in the light of a "Profession," and think its mission is far holier than to be used as a stepping-stone to places of worldly honor or promotion, but it would be unfair to estimate his character without making due allowance for the times during which he stepped upon the stage, for the opinions which so extensively prevailed, and for the mixed system of Church and State under which he grew up. It was impossible for one so situated to take no part in secular or political affairs, and the very desire to excel in the duties of his calling, would bear him inevitably towards a seat in the House of Lords. Behold him, then, at the start, an humble curate, a Shepherd in the midst of Salis-bury Plain. Full of animal spirits, thoroughly educated, the man who was fitted nearly above all to take delight in society and impart to it the highest charm, poverty stricken, without intercourse, without attrition, set down in the midst of a few hovels on a desolate moor, where he could see nothing between him and the horizon, and where once being overtaken at night by a snow-storm, he with difficulty found his way over the trackless place. Once a week the butcher came from the nearest town, and he sometimes was forced to dine on a few potatoes seasoned with a little catsup. At night he trimmed his solitary lamp and wrote his sermon for the poor people who attended his ministrations. But he lifted up his countenance with a cheerful alacrity.

We have often fancied a poor curate in a similar position with his head just peering above one of those high English desks, blocked in by one of Queen Anne's immense Bibles, reading prayers in a nasal drawl, and having an almost menial look, as if he bowed in subservience to the Lord of the Manor, instead of to the Lord of Lords. Such was not Sydney Smith! His only relaxation at this time was to dine on Sunday with the Squire, Mr. Beach. He was a valuable Squire, and had no slight share in directing the subsequent fortunes of his agreeable guest. *Sub tegmine fagi*—under the sheltering protection of that *Beach*,—if he did not yet cultivate his talents, *tenui avenâ*, (as he translates it,) "with a little oat-meal," he at least began his career on a scanty revenue.

With Mr. Beach's sons he set out for a German University, but Germany was in commotion, and in stress of weather, by chance, or guided by some higher destiny, he put into Edinburgh. It was an important man, put down in an important place, at an important time. This was in fact the starting-point of his fame. From this high eyrie he swept his eye about, surveyed the prospect, and aimed steadily at the goal. He never veered. The Scotch capital had attained to its most palmy intellectual state. What London was in the time of Johnson, a little farther back, such was Edinburgh then; with the exception, perhaps, that the Scotch feasts were plainer. There was the same alliance of talent with high breeding. The dinners at "the Club" found their counterpart in those "bad suppers" which he delights to recall, while elegant hospitality, which renewed its race of Thrales and Reynoldses, could gather at the same board a great conversationalist and great wit, a great metaphysician, a great historian, a great essayist, a great critic, a great novelist—and distinguished professional men without number—the very feast and nectar of the Gods!

Under such auspices commenced the Edinburgh Review, whose downright ability established it in favor at the very start, and which smacks of its old prestige, and comes out in its indigo-blue covers to this day. The principles on which it was to be conducted were settled between himself, Brougham, and Jeffrey in the eighth or ninth story of Buccleugh Place—a strong triumvirate which lasted for many years. There was a spice and flavor about the new Review which relieved it from the usual heaviness of such productions and commended it to the palate. Sydney's wit gave small offense, and was directed more at things than persons. Jeffrey's judgment was not tempered with mercy. He was unjustly and unnecessarily severe.

He could see no gems if they lay upon a heap of rubbish. He made war upon mediocrity, but he sometimes thought that he was only killing owls while he was "shooting Cherubim." All the better for the Review. He tuned up the loose strings of Byron to concert pitch, but he caused the violets to grow on the bosom of Keats. There was a crisis in political affairs. The eyes of the world had been fixed on the bloody masquerade of the passions enacted in France, where the very dregs and sediments of society were stirred up, and as the Greek poet has it, "justice and all sacred things reversed." The ideas of the Revolution were afloat. "The prevalent doctrines were that man was so benevolent as to wish only the happiness of his fellow creatures, so intellectual as to be able readily to discover what was best, and so far above the power of temptation as never to be drawn by any allurements from the paths of virtue. Gratitude was said to be vice, marriage an improper restraint, law an imposition, and lawyers, aiders of fraud. It is scarcely possible to conceive the extensive influence which these visions had on Society." There was a tremblant movement on the other side of the channel, a tendency in the direction of reform, yet a timely dread that new ideas indulged would riot in extravagance, and that any attempt at reconstruction would result in chaos and ruin. Toryism carried it with a high hand. Arrogant power was exercised inconsistent with the spirit of the British Constitution and laws; there were intolerable delays in the course of justice; justice itself was denied; severities which were the offspring of rougher times had been transmitted and adhered to a blander civilization like unsightly knots; social evils of a heinous character were permitted to exist without rebuke, and abuses had become so venerable as to receive a tacit respect. Against these the Edinburgh reviewers launched their bolts, and with such a rich field before them had work enough for many years, and that their graduated ideas became useful to the world when they went abroad, is evident from the fact that without turmoil, without revolution, we have seen many of those vexations assuaged or done away by the coalition of sound argument, cutting sarcasm, keen wit, and common sense.

In 1804, having in the meantime married Miss Pybus, Sydney Smith removed to London. Some mention is made of his struggling with poverty, and not until many years after was he blest with competence, and it was only toward the end of his life that he became rich. Great as his talents were, he was by no means on the high road to preferment, nor had the exercise of them in the Review ingratiated him much with the powers

which were. He was glad to accept the preachership of the Foundling Hospital at £50 per annum. He failed to obtain the use of a Chapel which had been offered to him on lease, being unable to get the necessary license from the Rector of the Parish, but he officiated as morning preacher at Berkeley Chapel, in John street, Berkeley square. His fame spread far and wide, and soon filled the building to repletion. Dugald Stewart, after hearing him, exclaimed—"those original and unexpected ideas gave me a thrilling sensation of sublimity never before awakened,"—and the Bishop of Norwich wrote—"he plainly showed he felt what he said and meant that others should feel too." A course of Lectures on Moral Philosophy excited the audience to enthusiasm. All the streets and avenues which led to the building in which they were delivered, were blocked up by the concourse of carriages. "There was not sufficient room for the persons assembling, the lobbies were filled, and the doors into them from the lecture room were left open; the steps leading into its area were all occupied, many persons to obtain seats came an hour before the time." His social powers were keenly appreciated, and in their most active and vigorous play. He was a welcome guest at Holland House, when Holland House was at the height of its glory; the Misses Berry, whose home had been the rendezvous of all which was elegant in letters from the days of Horace Walpole until now, and who still continued to draw around them the same circle of light to gild a beautiful and most protracted old age, blessed him with their smiles. He was admitted a member of "The Club," which contained upon its books the names of Johnson, of Burke, of Reynolds and of Gibbon. At his own house he gave modest suppers weekly, at which were collected many men distinguished at the bench, at the bar, and in the Church, beside agreeable emigrants who had sought refuge from the commotions abroad. Thus, although poor, his poverty was not of such a kind as to "freeze the genial current of the soul:" if he could not rise to higher place he was respected and celebrated in that which he enjoyed, and in the full flush of life and health, and buoyant spirits, he took no trouble on interest, although the King had said he was a "very clever man, but would never be a Bishop."

In 1806 the Whigs came into a short-lived power. "This ray of sunshine," he says, "was very cheering to one who had so long lived on the north side of the wall." And now his friends at Holland House were determined to see what they could do for Sydney Smith, and never rested from their exertions until they had obtained from the Chancellor, Lord Erskine,

the living of Foston-le-Clay, in Yorkshire, for him. Shortly after this, appeared those master-pieces of ironical writing, Peter Plymley's Letters, and produced a powerful effect. The secret of their authorship was well kept, although suspicion pointed with her long finger to one who combined a vast amount of wit and wisdom, who was then sunning himself and rusticating in a little village called Sunning, and said—Thou art the man.

The Residence bill passed in 1808. "From the blameable negligence on the subject of the residence of the clergy, which had existed for so long a period in the Church, one-third of the parsonage houses in England had gone to decay; and thus, by the effects of this bill, one generation of clergymen was compelled suddenly to atone for the accumulated sins of their predecessors, and to benefit their successors by building parsonage-houses out of their own private fortunes." At Foston there had not been a resident clergyman for one hundred and fifty years. There were three hundred acres of glebe-land, of the stiffest clay, and no buildings at all. With small means, the expenses of removing a family to that remote place, and with no help but the privileges of borrowing a small sum from "Queen Anne's Bounty," the gift seemed almost to neutralize itself, and its acceptance for a while to be impracticable. Nevertheless, the new Rector resolved to struggle through. The Archbishop, who was informed of the difficulties of the case, was good enough to remove the compulsion of building, of which, however, the incumbent did not avail himself from a manly appreciation of duty. He therefore removed his family and cheerfully bade farewell to the delights of London, to which he did not return for residence until advanced in life. His position from the contrast with his late experience, must have been, if possible, more dreary than that of his first curacy in the middle of Salisbury plain. No more dinners in the banqueting room of Holland House!—no more Berrys!—no more elegant companies composed of *Savans*, in the rarified air of refined society—no more lines of carriages drawn up in long array before the Church doors to listen to the young preacher, but a dwindled flock which had been given over to the dogs for a hundred years or more by the neglectful shepherds who will have to give an account of their stewardship. Yorkshire was not a desirable place for such a man to live in. Its dialect is a rough, old, homespun English, which refuses to glide into the Attic of more modern times. *Tota lingua Northumbrorum, maxime in Eboraco, ita stridet incondita.* Eez zur. A common man with a crooked stick would have served as well to

look after such a scrawny flock as Sydney Smith, who had been accustomed to tend merino sheep. Foston presented no inviting aspect; it was dull and level, and its tough clay would suck off a shoe or lock the wheels of a wagon against the tugging of the stoutest ox. The weather-cock of its Church pointed to no West End. Nobody was to be met on its highways but some honest yeoman sunk in the midst of difficulty, or some ambulating Squeers with his switch in his hand. The Rectory was a dismal hovel, composed of one room, looking on one side into a fowl-yard, and on the other into the Churchyard, or, supposing the fences of the latter to be broken down, into one joint-concern. O, Mother Church! O, venerable Society for the Propagation of ye Gospell in *Foreign* Parts! did it need a bill in Parliament to remedy such things?

If such neglects had not existed, Wesley had not been born. Methodism would not have lifted up her voice like a pelican in the wilderness, nor have thumped her ten thousand cushions, as there is reason to fear that she now will do until the crack of doom. Into such a living the Rector was instituted. Others, however, as well educated, have suffered greater hardships than these, especially those missionaries of the Cross whose *requiescat in pace* was too often tattooed on the stomach of a cannibal, (*Vide Syd. op. et joc. de simil. re.*,) or those who officiated in a Mohawk parish, or even among the North American Colonies, whose inhabitants soon came to be confounded with the copper colored and painted aborigines. We do not mention these things in order to bewail his lot as a hard one, but to represent it as it was. He knew as much of farming as he did of building, but with great energy he took both matters in hand. Those who will look into this charming book will find an amusing account of his troubles. He sat down in his "thinking chair" and concocted a plan which he called the "model of parsonage-houses." By the aid of his four oxen, "Tug and Lug, Hawl and Crawl," he drew the timbers, and "in nine months after laying the corner-stone, issued forth at midnight with a lantern to meet the last cart with the cook and the cat, which had stuck in the mud, and fairly established them in the new quarters." Architecturally, the house which he had thus built was said to be an ugly affair, but abounded in ingenious devices to promote true comfort, as was no doubt discovered by those who came after him when he waxed fat in his prebendal stall. We refer to the book for an account of his farming operations, of his telescope, of his rheumatic armor, of his cow-scratcher, of his domestics, of his horse "Calamity," and of his family coach, on the panel of which was inscribed the

motto—*Faber meæ fortunæ.* How lonely the place was may be gathered from the fact that one Sunday, as he was about to enter the Church, there was a general rush of the clerk, the sexton, the Church-wardens, and principal farmers after him, who, with agitated countenances, exclaimed—"Please your honor, a coach! a coach!" "Well, my good friends," he replied, "stand firm, never mind, even though there should be a coach, it will do us no harm; let us see." Lord and Lady Carlisle, who had come to visit him in a coach and four, were arrested in a field by the melancholy mud of Foston-le-Clay, and were obliged to hang out signals of distress. On another occasion, in the winter, at six o'clock in the evening, the family were assembled around a blazing fire waiting for dinner. "The weather had been unusually severe, and the roads were so filled by drifts of snow, that they were considered quite impassable. Suddenly a tremendous peal was heard of the bell. All started at the unwonted sound. Bunch rushed to the door and presently entered the room breathless, exclaiming, 'Please, Sir, Lord and Lady Mackincrush is com'd in a coach-and-four, and wants to stay with you, but they can't get up to the front door.'"

Sticking in the mud was a common occurrence at Foston-le-Clay. Nevertheless, though suffering from a deficient income, often burying his head in his hands in sad perplexity over his accounts, denying himself all luxuries except that of making other people happy, unable to buy books, and for one season, when the harvest was spoiled, actually wanting suitable bread, he lived in contentment for many years, and was a perfect model of that Christian grace. From his knowledge of medicine he was employed as a physician, and it having been discovered that "Master Smith" had a goodly stock of common sense he was elected a magistrate. In the meantime, he continued to contribute to the Edinburgh Review, and wrote and spoke in favor of toleration, and parlimentary reform, and against the laws disqualifying Roman Catholics. He made frequent visits to Edinburgh and London, where "the rush of invitations and struggle for his society would have been quite enough to turn any head less strong than his. Many weeks before he set off invitations used to come down into the country, but in the midst of all this dissipation and popularity he never forgot his home and family."

In 1828, Lord Lyndhurst, though differing from him in politics and against the wishes of his party, had the magnanimity to bestow on him a stall then vacant at Bristol, where he first preached on the 5th of November, before the Mayor and Corporation, the Cathedral being filled to suffocation, his celebra-

ted sermon on Toleration, making use of at the end, the beautiful apologue from Jeremy Taylor, "As Abraham was sitting at the door of his tent," &c. His promotion in the Church was a step which added very materially to his happiness. It increased his sphere and removed the incubus of poverty. His gratification was however damped by the death of his eldest son, the first sorrow of his life. He exchanged Foston for the much smaller but more beautifully situated living of Combe Florey, near Taunton. As a dignitary of the Church he now thought it becoming to put his name to what he should afterward write; he therefore withdrew from the Edinburgh Review. His popularity increased at Bristol, though he preached many unpalatable doctrines, and showed himself to be a man of business by the minuteness with which he investigated all the affairs of the Cathedral and Chapter. In a few years after, Lord Grey appointed him to a prebendal stall at St. Paul's, in exchange for the one which he held at Bristol. Thus promotion came at last, though not of that kind which he confesses at one period of his life to have ardently desired, and the King's remark held true, that he would never be a Bishop. With reference to this subject his daughter writes warmly: "I know he felt deeply to the hour of his death that those by whose side he had fought for fifty years so bravely and so honestly in their adversity, and with the most unblemished reputation as a clergyman, should in their prosperity never have offered him that which they were bestowing on many, only known at that time, according to public report, (whatever merits they may have since evinced,) for their mediocrity or unpopularity." At this period began his contest with the Ecclesiastical Commission, which lasted nearly four years, and was carried on principally in a series of letters addressed to Archdeacon Singleton. By the death of his youngest brother he now became rich. In the year 1843, he sent a petition to the American Congress for payment of the debt due to England by the repudiating States. He died on Feb. 22, 1845, in the seventy-fifth year of his age.

The above are the principal incidents in the career of one who was too practical to seek for romance, who was involved in no turmoil, but was the very centre of a peaceful and quiet revolution. With the exception of one or two brief visits to Germany and the French Capital, he stayed at home engaged in private or official duties. Social life, and its amenities, if he could have them, if not, the buoyancy of his own spirit, afforded him all that he craved of that stimulus which many seek in the excitement of travel, in the vapid fashions, or mere amusements of the world. And now, having read this charm-

ing book, in which the components of his character are so well blended, we hardly know how to retrace our steps and attempt the difficult work of analysis. We would estimate him in the same large and liberal spirit by which he judged others, although we dissent from some of his opinions, and from some of his principles. For instance, that "*no man should be subjected to civil incapacities on account of religious opinions*," we do not, in its full extent, admit. That no man should be subjected to *persecution* for religious opinions is a sentiment worthy of all the eloquent eulogium which he pronounces on the first.*

On the subject of Catholic Emancipation we concur in the spirit of his large and enlightened views. But we think that it was going too far, that it was inconsistent with right ideas of justice to the Constitution of the British Church and British realm, that it was pouring in at the spigot and letting out at the bung, to pay and strengthen a power which was the deadly enemy of that very toleration for which he so manfully fought. As a Clergyman of the Church, Sydney Smith belonged theoretically to no school which would be recognized then or now. That portion who modestly style themselves "evangelical," would not claim him, for he hated their intolerance and their bigotry, as much as that of Rome; he disliked their atro-bilious complexions and bad tempers, and he was disgusted with their cant.

When the new movement came up, he set his face against the Mediæval tastes which were cultivated at Oxford, and wrote to a friend—"I have not yet discovered of what death I am to die, but I rather believe that I shall be burnt alive by the Puseyites." The Church was in its most apathetic state, but he belonged neither to the irreligious, the non-residents, nor the sluggards. Too many then were affected by the contagion of the times. There were those who prepared themselves academically for Holy Orders on purpose to take advantage of family connections, to be made eligible to the gifts and benefices of the Church. Having obtained their livings they re-

* "From the principles of this system, from the cruelty of these laws, I turn and turn with the homage of my whole heart, to the memorable proclamation which the monarch of these realms has lately made to his dominions of Hanover, 'that no man should be subjected to civil incapacities on account of his religious opinions.' This sentiment, in the mouth of a king, deserves more than all glories and all victories, the notice of the historian who is destined to tell to future ages the deeds of the English people. I hope he will lavish on it every gem which glitters in the cabinet of genius; and so uphold it to the world that it will be remembered when Waterloo is forgotten, and when the fall of Paris is blotted out from the memory of man."—*Memoir*, vol. I, p. 183.

lapsed at once into the laic ranks. They spent their time in gay capitals, and sent their deputies with a stingy allowance to starve upon potatoes 'seasoned with a little catsup.' Hence the *humility* was supplanted by the *humiliation* of the Curate. The boldness which becomes a Clergyman and a man could not exist in such a starved-out set. The incumbents who remained, frequently indulged in a latitudinarian hilarity of life and manners. They shot and rode with as much zest as the Squire or the Lord, betted in the pit, swept the stakes at the table, were after the red-coated gentry, and 'in at the death.' Sometimes when the Parish Clergyman was preaching his afternoon sermon on the Sunday to a few drowsy hearers, his groom and horse and dogs were at the door, to convey him to some distant shire, to be ready at the break of day, as soon as the shooting season began.

Sydney Smith belonged to none of these. He really cared for none of these things. In his earliest childhood his mother speaks of him and his brothers, as "neglecting games, seizing every hour of leisure for study, and often lying on the floor stretched over their books, discussing with loud voice and most vehement gesticulation every point which arose;" contending together "like young athletes, as if life and death hung on the issue." Those make a great mistake who consider him as a mere joker. He published his Reviews to show that such an impression was ill-founded; but the tenor of his life will accomplish the object better still. There seldom lived a more earnest man, or one who more conscientiously did the work which he set his hand to with all his might. The way in which he did it might not accord with the views of others as conscientious as himself. There seldom lived a man who mixed so gayly in the world, who was yet so really above its spirit, or so incorruptible amidst its seductions. His wit, we confess, seems a little grotesque and anomalous in a dignitary of the Church, but he attended to his parochial ministrations with care and with affection, and was exemplary in his relations.

In addition to the charge of their spiritual concerns, by his skill in medicine, he healed their bodies, and in open Court he pleaded the cause of the poor and needy. He was more religious than pious. He had not the fervor of some people, but he had more principle. The sublime doctrines of Christianity he believed and inculcated, and its practical precepts he instilled with great force and beauty. "A distinction is often set up," he remarks in his Essay on Preaching, "between moral and religious subjects of discourse, as if every moral subject must not necessarily be a Christian subject. If Christianity

concern itself with our present as well as our future happiness, how can any virtue, or the doctrine which inculcates it, be considered as foreign to our sacred religion?" This is truth, and perhaps often lost sight of in the worrying contentions about vexed questions. We have not the least doubt that if the parable of the Good Samaritan were diluted into a modern sermon teaching exactly the same lesson, but without the charm of the tale, it would not be considered evangelical, and it would be said of the man who pronounced it that "he would never convert a soul."

Of the effect of his preaching we can only judge from the testimony of those who heard it. Mrs. Austin writes, "I must confess that I went to hear Mr. Smith preach with some misgiving, as to the effect which that well-known face and voice, ever associated with wit, might have upon me even in the sacred place. Never were misgivings more quickly and entirely dissipated. The moment he appeared in the pulpit, all the weight of his duty, all the authority of his office, were written on his countenance; and, without a particle of affectation, (of which he was incapable,) his whole demeanor bespoke the gravity of his purpose. Perhaps, indeed, it was the more striking to one who had till then only seen him delighting society by his gay and overflowing wit. As soon as he began to speak, the whole choir upon which I looked down, exhibited one mass of upraised, attentive, thoughtful faces. It seemed as if his deep, earnest tones were caught with silent eagerness; and I could not but feel that the perfect good sense, the expansive benevolence, the plain exposition of Christian duty, which fell from his lips, found a soil well fitted to receive it. I remember no religious service which ever appeared to me more solemn, more impressive, or more calculated to bear its appropriate fruit—the subjugation of fierce and restless passions, and the culture of a just, humane and Christian temper."

In a secular point, considering his moral and mental endowments, Sydney Smith was the man of an age, and stood boldly carved, and in strong relief, in the Pantheon of worthies. *Imprimis*, he had uncommon common sense. The first salutation which he received when he went to settle down in Yorkshire, was from the Clerk of the Parish, an old man, eighty years of age, whose face was shrewd, but seamed with furrows. "Master Smith," he said, as he struck his crutch stick in the ground, "it often stroikes moy moind that people as comes frae London is such fools, but"—giving him a nudge with his stick—"you, I see, are no fool." What he says of Macintosh,

in a letter to Francis Jeffrey, is a pretty clear index of his own mind. "I never saw so theoretical a head which contained so much practical understanding. He has always tried his profound moral speculations by the experience of life. He does not wish for the *best* in politics or morals, but for the best which can be attained; and what that is he seems to know well. Now what I object to Scotch Philosophers in general is, that they reason upon man as they would on a divinity; they pursue truth, without caring if it be *useful* truth. They are more fond of disputing on mind and matter, than on anything which can have a reference to the real world, inhabited by real men, women and children; a philosopher that descends to the present state of things is debased in their estimation." So we find that he himself, in the midst of the wild theories and universal panic, caused by the French Revolution, "neither dazzled by visions of impracticable good, nor alarmed by shadows of imaginary evil, seized upon those principles of which he was through life the dauntless and inflexible advocate." He had a marvelous tact of reaching the gist of the matter. He drew out the skulking subject by the neck and shoulders, from where it lay concealed among the thick leaves of disquisition, and presented it to the commonest apprehension so clearly that it "stuck right out." Abuse of whatever kind was sure to go down under such tremendous licks, such whacking and croaking knocks upon the 'nob' as he dealt it. He never meddled with that which was "past praying for," nor did he permit his brain to be crazed by dreams of Quixotic philanthrophy, but went upon the forays of a practical chivalry, and attacked no giants who had not a vulnerable point. Where the enemy was at a distance, he reached it by the swift arrows of his wit.

Nobody since the days of Franklin has so wielded the faculty of common sense for the common good. *Some* of Franklin's saws we think (much as we admire him) are absolutely vicious, and others well calculated to breed stinginess. A man who is over-careful with his money, will never be large in anything else. We do not like his "take care of the penny" maxims. Economy is bred in the bones, and seldom taught. Leave it alone. Men need to be liberalized both in thought and deed. There was no question which concerned the public weal for the half century or more, during which Sydney Smith employed his vivacious pen, upon which he did not bring this great faculty of common sense to bear, shedding upon it a new light by the appositeness of his remarks. Speaking of Education he says, "Never teach false morality. How exquisitely

absurd to tell girls that beauty is of no value, dress of no use! Beauty is of value. Her whole prospects and happiness in life may often depend upon a new gown or a becoming bonnet, and, if she has five grains of common sense, she will find this out. The great thing is to teach her their just value, and that there must be something better under the bonnet than a pretty face, for real happiness. But never sacrifice truth."

In one of his letters to Jeffrey he writes, "Living a great deal alone (as I now do) will, I believe, correct me of my faults, for a man can do without his own approbation in much society, but he must make great exertions to gain it when alone; without it, I am convinced solitude is not to be endured." "When you meet with neglect, let it rouse you to exertion, instead of mortifying your pride. Set about lessening those defects which expose you to neglect, and improve those excellencies which command attention and respect."

"Fallacy I.—Because I have gone through it, my son shall go through it also."

"Fallacy II.—I have said I will do it, and I *will* do it. I will stick to my word."

But Sydney Smith was known for his *wit* at a time when he was not so well known for that which will stand him more instead. He thinks he owed somewhat of his constitutional gayety to an infusion of French blood, as he certainly possessed that enviable disposition which is happy under all circumstances, and adapts itself to any fortune. This was farther increased by a sound mind in a sound body, as well as by conviction and religious determination. So, indeed, he was never out of the vein, but at the age of seventy-four was enabled to write that he was on the whole a happy man, that he had found the world an entertaining world, and was thankful to Providence for the part allotted to him in it. Although his humor sometimes flowed in excess, and might be deemed extravagant, yet the quality was healthful and perennial, and not pumped up. Newton has declared that "wit is the Devil's inspiration." Oh, fudge! fudge! It is the gift of God. It is lamentable that so good a man should have uttered so foolish a speech.

As a Clerical attribute, we think it might be even used to advantage, but as Sydney remarks, "there is very little mother wit in the world, but a great deal of Clergy." We cannot assent to the teetotal doctrine. We think the strongest and most sensible argument is from the abuse *for* the use. But we admit that it is a very hazardous inheritance, and the more so, as it is possessed in its keenest and subtlest power.

In the equilibrium of character, the excess of it will often correspond with the defect of that which is less brilliant, but of greater value. Alas! how often do those who possess the glowing graces which delight society, sink surely down, as these decay, beneath the level of contempt: and from our reading and from experience, too, we have been compelled to associate them too frequently with a gay prodigacy and unprincipled living. Darkness and melancholy brood over the banqueting rooms, where only wits and worldlings met together, and took "no note of time." The feast is over, the lights are gone, its memories fled, the song, the sally, and the loud applause come back no more. The flashes which illumined it were but the phosphoric brilliance which hovers over decay.

Sydney Smith has often been compared to Swift, but his daughter takes an honest pride in pointing out one difference in her father's writings, that "there is not a single line in them that might not be placed before the purity of youth, or that is unfit for the eye of a woman: that he has exercised his powers to the utmost, without ever sullying his pages with impurities, or degrading his talents and profession by irreligion." And it is true that he has exercised his faculty most nobly. It was directed against abuses which had steadily refused to correct themselves, and which other methods had failed to reach. His conversational powers were exceedingly brilliant, yet in personal intercourse he seldom inflicted by any witticism a sting. His very frivolity was hardly frivolous. Even when his unequaled spirits broke out into the most fantastic fancies, ludicrous images, and strange similitudes, considering the point at issue, and the direction in which they told, they had their value.

How different, yet how alike, were Sydney Smith and Doctor Johnson! They were both great talkers, but the latter was overbearing and dogmatic, and gave offense. Each had the same summary method of execution and despatch, the same integrity of heart and purpose. One was a benevolent and uncompromising Whig, the other a kind-hearted and savage Tory. One had a perpetual sycophant at his elbow, but the other would not tolerate one in the whole realm. Sydney, true to his liberal instincts, saw something to admire in his neighbors across the channel, but the Doctor, full blooded Briton that he was, despised the frog eaters. *Graeculus esuriens ibit in oxlum.* Sydney had a little prejudice against Scott, Johnson a good many against Scotland. "Scotland!" said he, in one of his furious onslaughts, "Scotland is a miser-

able country;" and, forgetting the good breakfasts which he ate there, he began to rail against its oatmeal and scrub oaks, until the old gentleman whom he addressed boiled over with indignation. "How dare you call it a miserable country? God made Scotland." "God made h—, Sir." How rude, if not profane, was this for the good Doctor! How brutal! See how differently Sydney touches off the little peculiarities of the Scotch, by a picturesque and witty description. He knew them. He had not made a hasty tour to write in sesquipedalian phrases about Iona and Mona, about the gaunt and solemn promontories of the Orkneys and the Hebrides. He had seen the Scotch, and respected their feelings. He kindly used a weapon which would hurt them least, because they are invulnerable to a joke. "With a little oatmeal for food, and with a little sulphur for friction, holding his Bible in the one hand, and his Calvinistic Creed in the other, Sawney scampers away over the flinty hills to sing his own Psalm out of tune amid the imposing melancholy of the tallest thistles." That must be a poor country indeed, and those inhabitants thin-skinned, whose wrath would be excited by a jocosity like the above. *Risum teneatis amici!* No one who loved the bagpipes would surely be offended at this delicate allusion to the Caledonian violin.

But it is for the sterling qualities of his heart, even more than for the endowments of his intellect, that Sydney Smith will live in the memory of men. He professed to have, and he had, a passionate love of justice and humanity and common sense. Speaking of justice, he beautifully says: "Truth is its handmaid, freedom is its child, peace its companion, safety walks in its steps, victory follows in its train; it is the brightest emanation from the Gospel, it is the greatest attribute of God. It is that centre round which human motives and passions turn; and justice, sitting on high, sees genius and power and wealth and birth revolving round her throne, and teaches their paths, and marks out their orbits, and warns with a loud voice, and rules with a strong hand, and carries order and discipline into a world which but for her would be a wild waste of passions." His life was one of remarkable consistence throughout. His was an *incorrupta fides*—an unimpeachable fidelity. Nor to any can the words of the Classic poet more deservedly apply:

> Justum et tenacem propositi virum
> Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
> Non vultus et instantis tyranni,
> Mente quatit solida.

If, as a high dignitary of the Church, and one who confessedly aspired to the most solemn and responsible position in it, it may be alleged that he ought somewhat to have restrained his exuberance, to have dammed up his nature, and to have prevented his flowering shrubs from climbing over the wall, he set a proud example in some of the highest moral qualities which can adorn a Christian or a man. He gave all which he had to the cause of that humanity which he loved, without the hope or prospect of reward. Living in the very atmosphere where the greatest subservience is paid to rank, and in an age which was peculiarly corrupt, he contracted no depravity from miasma, and continued sound to the core. With the shining talents which were his, he might have crooked his supple joints, and reached at once the pinnacle of fame. He walked erect and manly in the humble vale. Poor, and without the prestige of rank, he raised his head above the Lords temporal and spiritual, and thundered truth into their ears. He never veered from duty for the sake of favor, nor sacrificed one principle for selfish aggrandizement, nor yielded conviction to prejudice, nor slaved himself in the trammels of party. He made no use of flattery, nor yielded to its seductions. He had better arrows in his quiver. He tore the mask from the face of hypocrisy, and was above disguise and petty meanness. He fought with the minority when he had everything to lose, and sometimes opposed the Whigs in power when he had everything to gain.

There is something sublime in the moral courage which drove him into the very teeth of Government, and caused him to stand almost alone against the guards of the palace, bearing down with a strong sense against the deep foundations of error, and flashing against the castellated battlements of existing power. But he placed at the same time his back against the pressure of popular frenzy, and chimed in with no watchword of the mob. And it is like turning from a battle field to gaze upon some quiet and softly tinted picture, when we follow this great man into the blandishments of social circles, and the delights of his little family, giving "the oil of joy for mourning, and the garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness;" to see him rise up with alacrity of a morning, and sit down at his own table, "feeling," as he would say, "refreshed like a giant to run his course;" or when, upon a summer's day, he would fling himself into his great chair and cry out, "I feel like a bridegroom in the honeymoon; thank God for Combe Florey; Diana, *glorify the room*, throw open the windows, let in the blessed light;" or when upon a Christmas festival he returned

from the sublime duties of the morning, he took his seat among the festive group, diffusing all around him that happiness, in a grateful sense of which "he thanked God that He had made him merry. It was a better gift than much wheat and bean land with a doleful heart." Did space permit we should be glad to trace the course of his writings, in which he battled so manfully for justice to men, and for justice and toleration towards women. It has been remarked that "there is no youth in his writings;" it might have been said with equal propriety, that they show no age, no decrepitude.

In conclusion, we cannot refrain from quoting a passage by Mrs. Austin: "High as Sydney Smith's reputation stood during his life, it has unquestionably risen since his death. If not more wide-spread, it is more just, and more worthy of his great moral and intellectual qualities. Still more perfect justice will doubtless be rendered to him by posterity. Admiration of his wit will become subordinate, as it ought to be, to respect for the purposes to which it was applied, and for the good sense by which it was guided."

Art. III.—DR. HENRY'S TRANSLATION OF COUSIN'S PSYCHOLOGY.

Elements of Psychology: included in a Critical Examination of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, and in Additional Pieces. By Victor Cousin. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by Caleb S. Henry, D. D. Fourth improved Edition, revised according to the Author's last corrections. New York: Ivison & Phinney, 321 Broadway. (Successors of Mark H. Newman & Co.) Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 111 Lake Street. Buffalo: Phinney & Co. 1856. Large 12mo. pp. 568.

We suppose there is no doubt, at the present day, in the mind of any person who is at all competent to form any opinion upon the subject, that Cousin is to be *the* great name in the history of Philosophy for the first half of the present century. What the second half may bring forth, no one can, as yet, say. Nor would we cast so much of a slur upon those energetic thinkers and aspiring geniuses whom we have amongst us, as would be implied in the intimation of a belief that we have not now amongst us, and even amongst the names which are not altogether unknown to fame, some one who may rise to be even a more conspicuous light than the great French Philosopher himself. We are placed in a peculiar position, and are surrounded by circumstances which stimulate the mind to its most intense activity. And if we are not to produce a mind who shall recast the whole cycle of metaphysical science anew, we certainly have a *people* who look into the great problems of philosophy, as no other people ever did, and whose minds must be supplied with the best literature and guided by the best thinking that we can command, or an abyss of infidelity, moral corruption and anarchy, such as the world never yet saw, is before us as our inevitable doom.

Whatever we may think of Cousin's Method, or of his System, or as a result of his Method—whether we adopt his theory or reject it—whether we admire his style or consider his books to be (as some among us profess to regard them) among the most dangerous and powerful means of corruption,—it has come to be a fact about which, *as a fact*, we need waste no time or energy in disputations; that the writings of Cousin have a power to charm and to work their way into a wide circulation,

seize hold of, and control the minds of readers,—especially young readers, that no writings which deserve to be dignified with the name of Philosophy—ever before possessed. The fact that the work cited at the head of this Article has attained its *fourth* edition in the translation, besides all the copies which are bought and sold in the original French, is sufficient proof of its circulation. Nor is this the only proof. What Dr. Henry says in the Preface to his Second Edition, as the result of his own experience as a teacher, has been confirmed, we doubt not, by the experience of every one who has used any of Cousin's books as text-books. Speaking of himself in the third person, the Doctor says he had occasion to learn, too, in his own experience as a teacher, that none of the books ordinarily put into the hands of students, in their philosophical course, was studied with so lively an interest, or with so much profit, as this. Others may differ from the translator of the work referred to, in the estimate of the "*profit*" derived from Cousin's Review of Locke's Essay, but there can be no difference of opinion, we apprehend, as to the interest which this work always excites in the minds of those who study it.

The volume named at the head of our Article is made up chiefly of the third volume of the second series of Cousin's Lectures in the course of the History of Modern Philosophy. "This course," says MORELL, the Author of "the History of Modern Philosophy," will, in all probability, be ever the most popular of his (Cousin's) writings; the distinct classification it makes of systems; the brief yet intelligible glimpses it affords into the interior of almost every school, whether ancient or modern, together with *the detailed analysis of Locke, in which is said almost all that ever need be said about that Essay on the Human Understanding*, in a word, the singular union of the most sober criticisms of the Psychological school, with occasional flights into the higher regions of metaphysical analysis, all concur to secure for the course of 1829, an interest and value peculiarly its own."* And the same writer adds, "Of all nations in the world, the French are among the greatest masters of prose; and of all their prose writers, scarcely any one can be said to excel Cousin in power of expression and perfect finish of style."

As early as 1829, Sir William Hamilton, who will hold a place doubtless next to that of Cousin in the History of Philosophy, expresses his opinion of Cousin and his works in the following terms:

* Edinburgh Review, April, 1851, p. 228.

"Condemned to silence during the reign of Jesuit ascendency, M. Cousin, after eight years of honorable retirement, not exempt from persecution, had again ascended the Chair of Philosophy, and the splendor with which he recommenced his academical career more than justified the expectation which his recent celebrity as a writer, and the memory of his earlier productions had inspired. Two thousand auditors listened, all with admiration, many with enthusiasm, to the eloquent exposition of doctrine intelligible only to the few; and the oral discussion of philosophy awakened in Paris and in France an interest unexampled since the days of Abelard. The daily journals found it necessary to gratify, by their earlier summaries, the impatient curiosity of the public; and the lectures themselves, taken in short-hand and corrected by the professor, propagated weekly the influence of his instruction to the remotest provinces of the kingdom. . . . . M. Cousin is the apostle of Rationalism in France, and we are willing to admit that the doctrine could not have obtained a more eloquent or devoted advocate. For philosophy he has suffered; to her ministry he has consecrated himself—devoted, without reserve, his life and labors. Nor has he approached the sanctuary with unwashed hands. The editor of Proclus and Descartes, the translator and interpreter of Plato, and the promised expositor of Kant, will not be accused of partiality in the choice of his pursuits; while his two works, under the title of 'Philosophical Fragments,' bear ample evidence to the learning, elegance, and distinguished ability of their author. *Taking him all in all, in France M. Cousin stands alone; nor can we contemplate his character and accomplishments without the sincerest admiration, even while we dissent from the most prominent principle of his philosophy.*"

And again, in 1852, Sir William, speaking of his article in 1829, from which we have just quoted, says, "Moreover, I was still further disinclined to the undertaking, because it would behoove me to come forward in overt opposition to a certain theory, which, however powerfully advocated, I felt altogether unable to admit; while its author, M. Cousin, was *a philosopher for whose genius and character I already had the warmest admiration—an admiration which every succeeding year has only augmented, justified, and confirmed.* Nor, in saying this, need I make any reservation. For I admire even where I dissent; and *were M. Cousin's speculations on the absolute utterly abolished, to him would still remain the honor of doing more himself, and of contributing more to what has been done by*

others, in the furtherance of an enlightened philosophy, than any other living individual in France—I might say in Europe."

And we cannot forbear to add Dr. Henry's remark, and (if the Doctor's modesty will pardon us for it) point to the Doctor himself, as offering one more example "of a noble and useful Lesson," illustrating his own words. "This is noble! And it is a noble spectacle to see two such men, preëminent above all other men of the age for philosophical learning and ability, thus illustrating the beautiful utterance with which Cousin concludes his criticism of Locke: 'The true Muse of History'—the critical history of philosophy—'is not Hatred but Love.'"

We have accumulated these testimonies to show, that if there is yet remaining anywhere in the minds of any persons, a belief that by condemning, ridiculing, and scoffing at Cousin's works, we can get rid of the evil, that they may be supposed to do, the expectation is an idle one; the Lectures have been delivered; they have been published; they have been translated; they will be supplied by the Press as fast, and in as great numbers as they are called for; and they have a charm of style; a power of fascinating, which no writings on Philosophy ever before possessed, and which no writer of the present age can expect to surpass or hope to equal. These things, we say, with reference to the worst possible view that can be taken of the works of Cousin, and the labor of the American translator in bringing this, which is beyond all peradventure the most valuable and the most *interesting* of Cousin's writings, before the public.

In this view of the case, it is undoubtedly better that the work should be introduced with such notes and comments as may serve to counteract its evil effects, if it is likely to be productive of any. Let it be used in our Colleges under the guidance of a Professor who is competent to point out its errors and refute them, (and if he is not competent to such a task he is not fit for his place,) and we shall put those young men beyond the danger of being misled by him for the whole of the rest of their lives. And not only so, we may thus convert them into champions of the truth, and able and ready to defend it, having already tried its strength and found the weak points of the adversary. It will never answer to infer from the fact, that a book is used as a text-book, that therefore all the views and opinions of its author are adopted. In any department of Metaphysical and of Theological Science, too, it is often the most successful way of teaching any system, and especially if it be the true system, to use the best exposition and defense of any false system against which we may design to guard his

pupils, noting its statements, pointing out their error and their sophistry—as we examine in detail, and one after another the points and positions by which they are sustained. But even when the policy here indicated is not carried to the extent spoken of—something of the kind is always necessary in the Department of Speculative Philosophy. No book can anywhere be found that will not require from the Teacher, comments and corrections. On this point, there are a few words of Dr. Henry's, in the Preface to the present Edition of these Lectures of Cousin's, which are worth all the labor that the volume has cost him:

"In regard to the use of this work in instruction: the method of instruction by merely formal lectures is unsuited to the undergraduate course in our Colleges. Books are therefore put into the hands of the student to read, which are called text-books—a term which specially implies that they are to be made the basis of instruction by the professor. Many years' experience has established in me the conviction that no text-book in the hands of our young students is good for much, if for anything, without thorough instruction—earnest familiar exposition on the part of a competent professor, who is master of the whole subject, as well as acquainted with what this or that particular text-book says; and, with such instruction, almost any text-book is good enough.

"The student who attends on a philosophical course, attends to very little purpose if that instruction amounts to nothing but a catechetical examination, and a dry repetition of what he remembers of a text-book. It is a dead mechanical affair, with little clear insight and comprehension of the subject, and consequently little of that peculiar culture of the faculties, for the sake of which philosophical studies are made a part of his course of education. Contrary to all this, the interest of the students should be aroused, their attention directed, their perceptions quickened, by the living voice of the competent, earnest teacher, who knows and feels his subject himself in a living way, and knows how to tell what he knows and feels, and to make them know and feel with him; to make them grasp truth in its principles, to see into the nature, force and reach, the logical connection and systematic consequences of principles; to make them not only understand his thought, but think for themselves, exert their own critical faculties, form opinions, not merely adopt them. There is in such a course a high and noble culture of the faculties and of the soul, of infinitely more value than the amount of knowledge gained. It makes philosophers, not merely knowers of a philosophy, of

this or that set of opinions, adopting or rejecting the one or the other set, just according as they happen to be in good or bad odor among this or that particular set of men or—women. It is a consoling reward to any one whose life has been devoted to such labors to be humbly able to hope he has, in this way, done some good in his day, has helped to form right men."

We do not believe that more wisdom, or a truth of a higher importance (always, of course, excepting the truth of Revelation) was ever expressed in fewer or more appropriate words. We certainly would not carry the doctrine to the extent which Sir William Hamilton has done. But there is a truth in it. He says: "If the accomplishment of philosophy imply a cessation of discussion,—if the results of speculation be a paralysis of itself; the consummation of knowledge is a condition of intellectual barbarism. Plato has profoundly defined man 'the hunter after truth,' for in this case, as in others, the *pursuit* is all in all, the *success*, comparatively nothing."*

We certainly think that the "*success*" or the "*results*" of philosophy—at least the results which it ought to attain, and is most certainly seeking, deserve to be held at a higher estimation than is here placed upon them. But beyond a doubt the discussion and pursuit themselves are of great value when properly conducted, as means of disciplining and developing the mind. It can hardly need remark, that for this purpose it is better to use for a text-book the most accredited exposition of the doctrines we wish to confute, than any book which is merely devoted to the inculcating the doctrines which we wish to enforce.

We have thus far spoken of Cousin's writings—on the hypothesis that they are as dangerous as they have been supposed to be by any serious minded, thinking man; of course we do not take so unfavorable a view of them. We believe that his writings and labors will prove to have been of the most salutary character. In this we speak for ourselves alone —and not by any means in the editorial plural, (we,) as if expressing the views which the Review may have adopted, or is to be held responsible for.

This is not the time or the place to go into any discussion of Cousin's writings or doctrines as a whole. We ought, however, in justice to ourselves, to say that there are some two or three points, at least, in his philosophy, from which we most decidedly dissent. We have no time to state them at length; still less to argue them. It will be sufficient to say, that the

* Page 46, Harpers' edition.

first point to which we would refer, is his theory of the inerrancy—not to say, as he has done, the "infallibility," of the spontaneous Reason, as the ground of absolute truth. We do not consider his doctrine any answer to Kant; and we do think that it renders impossible any objective standard of truth.* Again, we regard his theory of Inspiration as untrue to the facts of the case, and as having a tendency most unfavorable to any due regard to that which is Positive; and especially to the Positive Institutions of Christianity. And again, thirdly, there are passages and expressions constantly occurring throughout Cousin's writings, which, though we may regard them as mere rhetoric and eloquence, if one chooses to do so, and apologize for them on that ground, as Dr. Henry has seen fit to do; in our judgment, admit of no justification or apology. We give the following as perhaps one of the most objectionable, taken from Dr. Henry's "Additional Remarks," in reply to the Princeton Review:†

"He is a God at once true and real, at once substance and cause, always substance and always cause, being substance only so far as he is cause, and cause only so far as he is substance: that is to say, being absolute cause, one and many, eternity and time, space and number, essence and life, indivisibility and totality, principle, end, and centre, at the summit of being and at its lowest degree, infinite and finite together, triple in word; that is to say, at the same time God and nature and humanity. In fact, if God be not everything, he is nothing."

On this the Doctor remarks: "Now, no matter how startling these expressions may seem, (and they are anything but agreeable to me,) yet thus torn from the preamble which should govern their interpretation and presented alone—the juridical mind will appreciate the remark—it is a violation of the simplest rule of just criticism to insist that they mean Pantheism, and can mean nothing else, especially since Cousin elsewhere in the strongest terms combats and confutes every form of Pantheistic conception of God."

Dr. Henry then proceeds to accumulate a few of the many eloquent and forcible passages in which Cousin has developed views most directly opposed to Pantheism, and even combatted Pantheism in direct issue. Such passages abound in his writings; and nowhere within the range of our reading have we ever seen more perfect demonstrations of the utter absurdity of

* See Lecture III, on the True, Beautiful, and Good. Appleton's edition, p. 65, *et seq.*

† Page 42.

Pantheism, in any of its forms, as a doctrine of ontology, than are to be found in the Lectures of Cousin. And yet we cannot accept Dr. Henry's apology for such a passage as that just quoted. It may involve Cousin in a *contradictio in adjectis.* But that does not help the matter at all. Such a passage cannot be *explained.* It may be contradicted and refuted, and, if you please, from the writings of Cousin himself. But what then? Is this the first time that such a theory has been taught? By no means. It is a theory that every reader will meet with sometimes. And it is a theory which every teacher and professor of Philosophy in our schools and colleges is bound, in fidelity to his trust and his position, to state, discuss, and refute in the presence of his pupils. And there can be no doubt but what it is directly opposed to the view of theism which Cousin intends to inculcate.

On the theory of Inspiration we wish to say a word more. There is no doubt that truth is one—and is truth irrespective of the *immediate* source from which it comes into the mind. But between the spontaneous activity or the Reason, which Cousin calls Inspiration, and that Inspiration of which the Holy Scripture is the record, there is this broad difference, that Inspiration comes as a specific act which superadds to that guilt which attaches in all cases to the neglect or rejection of a truth, the guilt of disobedience also in the case of those who reject or neglect the truths which are revealed in the Bible. They emanate not only from the Reason of God, as Cousin would say, but also from his Will and Sovereign authority. If we have discovered a truth, it will be useful to mankind. But if God has specially *revealed* a truth to us, that we may declare it to others, then it becomes not only a truth, but a truth especially commended to us by the authority of the Most High.*

This distinction, we think, Cousin has overlooked altogether, or if not, he certainly has not given it the prominence which it deserves. We think that the whole tendency of his writings

* Perhaps a better statement (for some purposes) may be given to this distinction, as follows: In the one case, that of the Spontaneous activity of the Reason, God has so constituted our minds, that they cannot but conceive and judge in certain ways, as when we conceive actual Nature as an Effect; and when we judge that every Effect must have a Cause. But in the other case, Inspiration, God communicates the conceptions and judgments—the thoughts already formed—directly and perhaps immediately to the mind. In the first case, therefore, Divine influence upon the mind can never be a matter of consciousness. In the latter case it would necessarily be a matter of consciousness, and the difference between the two, in many important respects, would be precisely that between a proposition when given as the *advice* of a friend, and when given in the *command* of one having authority.

and speculations are against admitting any such authoritative character as distinctive of the Jewish and Christian Religions. But is this peculiar to his system? Is it a position new to speculative philosophy? So far from it that we regard it as an element in all the speculations of our day which are most characterized by life and energy, and which are creeping into our public Lectures, our Light Literature, and into some of the most popular forms of theology. We regard it, however, rather as an undesigned consequence, than as an intended effect of Cousin's teaching. It is this very fact that speculations of this kind are finding their way into the reading and thinking of our people everywhere, and thus undermining the very foundations of those institutions upon which the stability and progress of society depends, that constitute, in our estimation, one of the most forcible reasons for such a use of these Lectures of Cousin, as Dr. Henry proposes.

But this is not the only or the most forcible claim that this volume has upon us. The writings of Cousin from the very method which he has taken, present a much more just and adequate conspectus, or resume, of the results of speculative philosophy, than any other work that has ever appeared. He was Professor of the History of Philosophy, and conceived the idea of gathering from the history of the systems and discussions of the past, all the principles, and facts, and doctrines which such a survey would *bring* together, as having been proved and stood the test of time and of criticism. No one will question his industry and research in examining. No one questions his sagacity and power of comprehension as a critic. And few, if any, that are acquainted with his writings, will hesitate to award to him a spirit of fairness, and a measure of good, sound common sense, as well as a balance of mind which are seldom found in a professed metaphysical writer. In fact, we know of no man in the history of philosophy, who, in all these respects, is, or was so well qualified for this task as Cousin himself. And as Dr. Henry remarks, there is scarcely a thought, or principle, of much value in the whole of Cousin's writings, which the Doctor has not gathered into this volume, either in the Lectures on Locke's Essay and the notes to them, or the "Additional Pieces" at the end of the book.

And here, once for all, permit us to say in regard to Dr. Henry's share in the work as Translator and Editor, that his qualifications for his task, and his fidelity in executing it, are such as to need no commendation. The fact that a fourth enlarged edition has been called for, is in itself sufficient, and would render all other commendations not only useless, but an

impertinence. We have, however, one criticism to make. Dr. Henry calls the work a "Psychology." But certainly it is not a preliminary work in Metaphysics,—as such a title, whether we regard the etymology of the word or Cousin's use of it,—would lead us to expect. Its proper and successful use presupposes and demands some preliminary psychology,—which shall give a more elementary account of the Natural History of thought, if we may so call it,—describing more minutely, and step by step, the progress from sensation to perception, conception, judgment, &c. And secondly, it requires, (as much as any book that we know of,) in order to a thorough comprehension, and an intelligible discussion of its contents, a knowledge of the Primary Formulæ, Terms and Methods of Logic. In this view of it, we should much prefer to call the work an Elementary Treatise on Ontology, exhibiting, as it does, the grounds of our belief in Nature, the reality and freedom of the soul of Man, and the existence, creation, power, and Moral Government of God. It presupposes, as we have said, Psychology and Logic, and discusses questions belonging to those departments only as they are requisite and subsidiary to the higher discussions, which manifestly are the main points in the author's design, namely, to prove the reality of absolute truth, the immortality and moral freedom of the soul, and the reality of a God who is Creator, and Moral Governor of the world.

But, again, it is not only on the ground of its being the most complete and well-digested resume of the results, thus far obtained by Philosophy, that the work under consideration deserves attention and study. It is a criticism and a review of Locke's Essay. It is not, however, merely as a literary work, nor yet as a work on Philosophy, simply, that that Essay comes to be deserving of the attention which Cousin has given it,—or that can give to his criticism upon it the importance which we must attach to that criticism. Everywhere among thinking men it will occur as one of the first theories to account for our knowledge that "all ideas are derived from sensation," that all truths except those relating to the properties and doctrines of matter, are merely the result of usage and conventional agreement among mankind,—that duty is but an enlightened self-interest, pursuing expediency as the wisest and safest guide. Such views will occur to all men at some time in their lives. With the mass of men they seem to be congenial, and in ages of degeneracy, forgetfulness of God, and when a whole community—or at least its controlling minds—are bent on some scheme that will not bear a close scrutiny, such views are proclaimed as the only wisdom, the true philosophy, the only

useful morality; and, if not religion itself, then something that is vastly better. We do not overstate. Again and again has it been declared, when speaking of some result of this system of Philosophy, as contrasted with a doctrine alleged to be contained in the Bible—that if the Bible taught such a doctrine, one that contradicts the philosophical tenet, "the sooner the Bible were destroyed the better,"—"the less we have of Christianity the better for man." It is, therefore, chiefly as the best and most systematic inculcation of the fundamental principles of mental science, for which, and upon which, as a basis, the system of philosophy,—and the views of man, of society, and of duty just alluded to, are based,—that the Essay on the Human Understanding deserves so much attention; and this review of that Essay comes to be so important a work for the best interests of Humanity and of Religion. It is certainly well known, and need not be asserted at length here, that Locke himself was a Socinian,—that his Essay was opposed at the time it appeared, and has been opposed ever since by the best minds of English Literature and Theology, as tending to subvert the Christian Faith, and all the Principles of Order and of Morality; that not only the infidelity of Hume, but also, that of Collins, Dodwell and Mandeville were based upon Locke's Psychology. Nor was it until after William of Orange had deliberately sold the Church of Scotland into the power of her enemies,—not, indeed, now as did Judas sell his Lord and Master for thirty pieces of silver,—but for support to his scheme of ambition and personal aggrandizement, and when to carry out those schemes, the Church itself had been made a mere political tool, and come to be filled with men who could easily shake off the most sacred obligations, or explain away the most sacred commands of duty and of religion,—that Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding and Paley's application of its principles to Morality and Polity, were received with favor by those who occupied high positions of authority and influence in the English Church. And finally, Hoadly of Bangor in the Church, and the Presbyterians out of it, made the application of those fundamental principles to religion; and the result in the Church was the Convocation silenced for its attempt to resist false doctrine by censuring Hoadly, and out of it the degeneracy of the entire Presbyterian body in England into Socinianism; and in this country, we have the lapse of a large part of the descendants of the Puritans into a so-called Unitarianism.

We cannot, in this place, undertake to trace this development step by step. Nor need we. It has been done, often al-

ready. It stands written in nearly all the attempts at the History of modern Philosophy, and will yet occupy a far more prominent place in the history of modern thought, and the philosophy of modern history, than has thus far been assigned to it.

If, then, there are expressions and statements in Cousin's work which we have reason to reject, and to wish were otherwise, we must consider that it is an answer to a system,—which sustained as it is by all the natural stupidity of our nature, by all the devotion to self-interested schemes of worldliness and ambition, and more than all by the wish to escape the restraints and the duties of religion and forget the realities of God, of Eternity, and of a Future Life,—an answer, we say, to a system which sustains and is sustained by all these powerful influences; and moreover, that it is such an answer as, by its completeness, its vigorous analysis, its unanswerable force of reasoning, and its beauty and attractiveness of style, has never before appeared, and in the ordinary course of things could not appear again in centuries. Nothing, however, is perfect, and if this work be objectionable, let it be remembered that it is a bold, a noble and manly effort to restore life and vigor to the belief in the great fundamental facts of Religion and Morality.

We have already expressed our dissent from several of the points of Cousin's Philosophy. Still, however, we think that it possesses a great and surpassing value in the triumphant success with which it refutes the most pernicious errors of the several systems to which, in a practical age, or a corrupt one, men are devoted from self-interest; and which in the few centuries past had, both in England and in France, succeeded in a pretty thorough extinguishment of Faith and of philanthropy. But his system needs further shaping and modification before it will become constructive of the true Faith and the true views of life and duty. No mind, however, has yet appeared to give to the Eclectic philosophy that positive direction. And Philosophy, if it be true, and true to its mission, must be the handmaid of religion, and by all the light which she can bring to bear upon the great problems of man, his duties and his destiny, she must lead to results which are in noways contrary to the doctrines of religion. And by religion we mean not that vague, indefinable something of which many speak. But we mean that definite system which, in this country, we receive as "the Doctrine and Sacraments, and as this Church hath received the same according to the Commandments of God." For it is true, as Ritter has said in his History of Philosophy,

"It is impossible to disguise or reject the truth that to-day, as erewhile, philosophy then only first finds its place within the mind of man, when agitated by conflicting opinions, he is a victim to doubt upon all that interests him most nearly and dearly,—God, Nature, and Life." And we may add, that all experience of the past shows that when such doubts have diffused themselves into any community, a return to faith is possible only through a sound and thorough philosophy, exhibiting in their most general and comprehensive forms, the processes of thought and the grounds of belief. If man had never fallen from his pristine purity, it is very possible that we should never have had any Philosophy, or any need of it; but as it is, Philosophy has come to be not only an indispensable part of a liberal education, but it is for all thinking minds,—for all minds whose energy of thought foreruns their reading, and anticipates results which others have obtained before them. There are those who have no such wants. The few thoughts that they possess have been adopted from the thinking of other minds. The little that they know has been obtained from books,—and for such persons it will seem to be the height of folly, and wickedness also, to put into the hands of people a book that contains anything that is not true, or will suggest a thought that may need modification, and quite possibly, refutation. They will, therefore, not be content with crying "sour grapes" over what is beyond their reach, but in the most earnest sincerity of heart they will cry out "mad dog" also, if by any means they may be able to keep others from the danger. It is impossible to convince such persons of their mistake, or to reason those who are frightened with this horror-cry, out of their panic. It is easy to frighten the timid, but not so easy to reason them out of their fright, even when it is wholly groundless.

But there are those for whom Philosophy is an indispensable necessity. "It is acknowledged," says Ritter, "as a universal law of human progress, that no active effort of the scientific mind is possible, unless accompanied by a philosophic impulse." Nor is this all. Such activity, unless it is guided by a sound philosophy, will inevitably run into results and doctrines most adverse to Religious Faith and Christian Morality. The infidelity so often remarked in those who have been devoted to the pursuits of physical science within the last century, can be traced undoubtedly to the inadequate philosophy by which the processes of induction were explained, and upon which the certainty of its results were based.

But again; there is another class for whom indirectly a

deeper philosophy than either the English school of Locke, or the Scotch school of Reid and Stewart has produced, is indispensable. We refer to the thoughtful among those who are regarded as the uneducated,—those whose *hands* are occupied with the daily task of earning their bread,—and who in the solitary pursuit of their labor, are musing on the profound mysteries of life and of Nature. They will read no books of philosophy, it is true, be they never so plenty, never so sound; but they are often bewildered in the maze of their own thoughts,—and the man of education, the clergyman, or the scholar who undertakes to set them right, or to converse with them on these subjects, will find that they, without knowing it, have thought as Plato Plotinus, Bœhmen Leibnetz, had thought centuries before; and thus to unravel their thoughts, explain their views to them, and lead them out of their errors, and to a Christian Faith, we shall need to have mastered the deepest discussions of Philosophy, and be able to explain them in the every-day language of the laborer, the farmer, and the mechanic.

The great mass of unbelief and misbelief in our land depends rather upon philosophical than on scriptural grounds. The justification and defense from Scripture is only an *after thought.* This assertion is as true of the Predestination of the Calvinist, as of the Humanitarianism of the Unitarians, or the Deism of the Rationalists. The denial of Sacramental efficacy proceeds chiefly from psychological grounds; and the denial of the Eternity of future punishment by the Universalists, implies a view of the relations of Time and Eternity which Ontology shows to be absurd. Not that we have the slightest expectation that Philosophy is to take the place of Theology. We have no idea that Christianity has proved a failure, or is likely to. But we do look to philosophy to correct the errors which she has committed,—to remove the obstacles to a true and earnest Faith, which she has interposed, and to keep down those rebellious promptings of our nature which are constantly rising as science ("falsely called") against the doctrines of Revelation. And if there are any who have no need of philosophy, —who feel no such want, we will congratulate them on their exemption from this want as an infirmity, if they will not allow us to commiserate them on account of their exclusion from that world of thought and knowledge, from which, by the peculiarities of their constitution, they are quite shut out.

In this view of the matter we cannot but regard the work of our Reverend Brother, in bringing forward at a demand of the public this fourth enlarged Edition of his Translation from

Cousin, as a public benefaction. Few men, if any, have appreciated the philosophical wants of our age and nation more justly than he has; and no one has labored more zealously, or more successfully, or more acceptably in supplying these wants. This volume (of which as a mere literary work—a specimen of elegant and accurate translation we might say much, but forbear) will add new force to his claims upon the gratitude of the public, and secure for him, we doubt not, a new and a deeper response of thanks and of obligations from every genuine thinker in our land.

Art IV.—THE RULE OF CHRISTIAN OFFERINGS.

The History of Tithes. By I. Selden. London: 1518.

An Historical Vindication of the Divine Right of Tithes from Scripture, Reason, and the Opinion and Practice of Jews, Gentiles, and Christians in all ages. Parts I, II. By Thomas Comber, D. D., Precentor of York. London: 1682 and 1685.

An Essay concerning the Divine Right of Tithes. By the Rev. Charles Leslie. Works. Vol. VII. Oxford: 1832.

Journal of the Seventy-first Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of New York.

The Sacerdotal Tithe. By Adam Townley, Presbyter of the Diocese of Toronto, C. W. Pudney & Russell. New York: 1855.

The Divine Law of Beneficence. American Tract Society.

There is, perhaps, no one question which is engrossing more f the attention of the active working men of the Church, in he present day, than how we shall obtain the necessary means o carry on her work. From Maine to Louisiana, from Cape ɔd to Vancouver, there is one cry which comes with sin-ɡular unanimity from Churchmen of every shade of opinion, ear after year waxing louder and louder, until it has well nigh lrowned the Macedonian cry of old, and that is, for *money*, ONEY. While the land is teeming with gold, her merchants re princes, and the streets of her chief cities are studded with alaces which rival the cities of the old world, the growth of enturies, the Bishops of the Church are compelled to go with eavy hearts, bending to their task, and the clergy are sent rom door to door to beg the scanty pittance which serves to uild the scattered tabernacles in our Western wilderness, or o live, as gentlemen and professional men must, often on less han would be paid to a bricklayer or a porter. Meanwhile, the rowds of immortal souls, which swarm our cities, within he very sound of the Church's bells, much more the few sheep hat are scattered in the wilderness, have no Gospel sent to hem, nor Shepherds commissioned to tend them, by that hurch whose mission charter is to "preach the Gospel to very creature." And the learned Editor of the True Catholic, hen commenting on these things, but a few months since, was

[illegible] dollars, that so far as long the Church's work [illegible] the old [illegible] system of England, and the voluntary system of this country, have been proved utter failures. We might tell the advocates of this statement, who think that the pastors are inactive, to look at and them in their own and the neighboring parishes, and ask themselves, what is the Church doing for the Evangelization of those who are not the ordinary attendants on her services,—the multitudes of the outcast and the poor,—the [illegible] in which she is set as "the light" [illegible] of the country! Where are her [illegible] with [illegible] and asylums for the aged, and hospitals for the sick? [illegible] she faithful to her high and holy trust, as the benefactress and [illegible] of the land, the minister of God's bounty to the poor, the [illegible] of Christ? Where is the Gospel preached to the poor? But we prefer to point them to specific facts, which confirm what we have said; and happily we have these already prepared to our hand. The excellent Bishop of Western New York, in a pastoral letter to his Diocese, not long since, states that the average income of his clergy, from their parishes, is [illegible] *hundred and fifty to* [illegible] *hundred dollars*, and in some, absolutely not exceeding *one hundred dollars*. In 1838, the Convention of the Diocese of New York appointed a Committee, consisting of John Jay, Ogden Hoffman, John A. Dix, John R. Livingston, and James F. DePeyster, to inquire what could be done for the more generous and permanent support of the Parish Clergy of the Diocese. Without obtaining full data from every parish in the Diocese, they procured sufficient information for all the purposes contemplated, and they hesitated not to make the following statements in their report to the Convention:—

"In the majority of cases, both in the city and the country, where the salary ranges from one thousand to five hundred dollars, sometimes with, but most generally *without* a parsonage, it would appear to be frequently quite insufficient for the support of the clergyman and his family, even though they practise severe economy and daily self-denial. Of the parishes whose circumstances have been brought to the knowledge of your Committee, the Rectors of more than twenty receive less than five hundred dollars a year. Of these twenty the salaries of one half do not exceed three hundred dollars; and this, too, in instances where the clergyman is married, and has a family.

"In one case, a clergyman doing duty in two parishes, receives but two hundred and fifty dollars for his services in both. In another, situated in a wealthy county, the pastor has a parsonage and two hundred dollars, with no other perquisites than gloves and scarfs at funerals.

"The letters addressed to the Committee have satisfied them that the insufficiency of their salaries has frequently occasioned, among our worthiest pastors, the most annoying pecuniary embarrassment, and sometimes painful distress and pinching poverty.

"One clergyman, in illustration of the point, refers to the case of a reverend brother of high character, good talents, and more than respectable scholarship,

hful and diligent laborer in the Church,—who confessed to him that *he* ıt *afford meat at his table more than once a week.*

ıther mentions, that on one occasion when ten clergymen had met to- ın the northern part of this state, the question was incidentally asked, ım curiosity passed around, 'Does your salary support you?' and the was invariably, 'No.'

. Not only in this diocese, and in this Church, but in the Republic, at large, ong the clergy of all denominations, the average clerical income is many maller than that of the medical or legal professions; and there is reason ve that a majority of our clergy of this diocese, men of education, in- ce, and refinement, receive for their services in the Church a less ; than our journeymen carpenters and other mechanics obtain by their raft.

ave been again and again called on (writes a Reverend Rector) to aid, ith the scantiest pittance, clergymen destitute of the daily necessaries *and concealing themselves through misery.* I know educated, respectable, rthy clergymen, who, to avoid unqualified want and the possible starv- f their families, and with an unabated love for their sacred calling, r engaged in secular (I do not here mean academical or literary) avo- .

ne of the clergy connected with the diocese are already, as I am informed, . to accept such positions as clerkships in mercantile houses."

d then the result, so patent on the face of these state- ı, and so inevitable in a Church where they can be made ut contradiction.

ı candidates for Holy Orders are actually diminishing ..... and the ny of the writers already quoted, with that of many others to the like ompel your Committee to believe that well-grounded fears of poverty reatly tended to this result; nor are they prepared to regard the enter- : of such fears, by youth of good character and frugal habits, as satisfac- oofs of their unfitness for the sacred office."

w these *facts* (for such they undeniably are) call for our st consideration, and most earnest thoughts. Pass them ı cannot, if we feel the least interest in the future welfare r beloved Church. To leave them to take care of them- ı, would be equally disastrous. The time has come when must be fully discussed and fairly met. If the Church, ı we believe to be "the Church of the Living God, the and ground of the truth," is to possess the land which pen for her occupation and to mould after her own model abits and sympathies of the people who compose this Republic, we must devise some mode by which we shall the exigency in a practical way, and induce the people of ORD to pour out, of the abundance which He has given , that which will support and carry on her great work.

we have already stated that the system of parochial vment, which has been pursued in England, and the ıtary system of this country, (though in some respects : than the former,) have, so far as preaching the Gospel to nasses is concerned, both proved utter failures. What

then, is to be done? How are we to meet the case? We think the answer is to be found in the return to the Apostolic model, and the instruction of the people to bring their offerings once more into the treasury of the LORD as He hath bidden them, after the pattern which is, in its every particular, Divine. For the consideration of this plan, we have prepared the present Article.

We have placed at the head of it the principal works on the subject, more as a matter of reference, than with a view to enter into their respective merits. We merely remark, in passing, that the first part of Dean Comber's work, and Leslie's Essay, will well repay any one for their perusal; while those who wish to pursue the subject further, can do so in the works of *Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Carleton, Bishop Montague and Tillesly, Dr. Sclater, Mr. Thorndike and Sir James Sempil, all of whom have written on the subject.

There is, perhaps, no one fact lying nearer the root of all religion than that GOD requires from us continual proof of our entire dependence upon Him. We see it in every dispensation of His providence, since the fall. In Abraham, we have it in GOD's commanding him to leave his country and his kindred, to sojourn as a pilgrim and a stranger, in a strange land. In Israel, we have it in His suffering them to hunger in the wilderness, and feeding them with manna, that He might make them know that man doth not live by bread only. In Apostles, we have it, when they were commanded to provide neither gold, nor silver, nor scrip, for their journey. And, in the daily prayer which every Christian is bidden to use,—"Give us this day our daily bread." We might easily enlarge on this, and show how it is not only the key to that Divine economy which GOD employed under the Mosaic dispensation, but a principle which is recognized throughout the Christian, and how He has ever visited distrust in Him with some of His severest judgments. But we have to do now especially with the fact that GOD requires us to show this dependence, and to worship Him, not only with our lips, but with our substance. GOD is not satisfied, and we might add, no devout and pious heart, rightly instructed, could be, with honor which never passes beyond mere words, and costs it nothing. "Give unto the LORD the glory

---

* Bishop Andrewes, Pattern of Catechetical Doctrine. London, 1675.
Carleton, Divine Right of Tithes.
Bishop Montague, Acts and Monuments of the Church. London, 1642.
Tillesly's Animadversions on Selden's History of Tithes. London, 1621.
Sclater, Comment on Malachi. London, 1650.
Thorndike, Treatise on "The Rights of the Church."

due unto His name: *bring an offering*, and come into His courts."—"Honor the LORD *with thy substance*, and with the first fruits of all thine increase."—"Neither will I offer unto the LORD my GOD of *that which doth cost me nothing*," is the principle of the pious heart everywhere and at all times. GOD might, had He seen fit, have acted differently. He is not dependent upon us for the support of His poor, much less for the proclamation of His Gospel. He could have so diffused the gifts of His providence, as to have had no poor. He could have sent His ministering angels to publish the good tidings of salvation, and to have gathered all nations into His Church. But His infinite wisdom saw fit to make use of human instruments to be the almoners of His bounty, to be the conservators of His blessings to fallen man. And hence, the man who refuses to honor Him with His substance, to worship Him with his body as well as his soul, to be godly in his business as well as pious in the Church, is but half a Christian, whose practice denies his profession.*

This, then, is the foundation of the principle under which the Gospel must find its support among men. GOD, in committing to us the fullness of His bountiful Providence, did so with the reservation that we should employ part of it to His honor and glory in the support of His Church, and the relief of His poor.

And now the question suggests itself, if GOD does require us to give part of our means to Him, has He intimated any rule by which we may know *how much* He expects? Has the earnest Christian, willing to do all that GOD requires, any rule laid down for his guidance, as to how much of his substance he ought to devote to the LORD? We have no hesitation in replying, that we think he has. We believe that the Scriptures, of both the Old and New Testament, clearly indicate that GOD expects from every devout believer, that at least *a tenth* of his annual income should be reserved to religious uses. And we think that any one, who carefully examines the subject, must come to the same conclusion.

Let us, then, look at the argument we have from the instances recorded in Holy Scripture, taking them in the simple order in which they occur, without the transposition which logical acumen might suggest; and then consider some other reasons which may be brought in confirmation of it. We can, of course, within the limits of this article, give but a brief outline, referring our readers to the works we have named for the

* Hooker, v, lxxix, 1.

further elucidation and proof of some of the points we shall state.

It is a common mistake, and yet one which is made by the majority of men, to believe that the payment of *tenths*, or *tithes*, came in with the Mosaic dispensation; and the mistake shows how carelessly the Word of God is read by the multitude. The first instance, which we have in revelation, is the offering of Cain and Abel. "In process of time, (or as the margin reads, *at the end of days*,) it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of the flock, and of the fat thereof." Now there are two facts patent on the face of this offering; first, that, being a material sacrifice, it must have been made by Divine appointment; and, secondly, that it was made at some fixed time,—"the end of days." We should naturally suppose, *a priori*, that God, Who was so particular in requiring of man a *seventh* portion of his time, would not appoint an offering without giving some rule as to its quantity. And this supposition is fully confirmed by the LXX translation of the seventh verse of the same chapter, in which the account of the offering occurs. Οὐκ, ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἥμαρτες; ἡσύχασον. i. e., *If thou hast offered aright, but hast not divided aright, hast thou not sinned? Hold thy peace.* In regard to the LXX translation, we need only remark that its authority is sufficiently shown by the fact that it was generally quoted by the Apostles and the Fathers of the Church for the first four hundred years; and, to say the very least, it is the best comment now extant on the Old Testament. In reference to the text under consideration, we may add, that it is quoted literally according to the LXX translation by both Clement, of Rome,* and Irenæus;† that Tertullian‡ says, God rejected Cain's sacrifice because he did not divide aright that which he offered; and that the Council of Hispalis, an. 590, in enjoining the payment of tithes, speaks of the curse which fell on Cain for not dividing aright. And moreover, this translation gives the only intelligible reason why God rejected the sacrifice of Cain, settling that disputed point, what St. Paul means when he says, (Heb. xi, 4,) *By faith Abel offered unto* God (πλείονα θυσίαν) *a more excellent sacrifice*, i. e., *a larger quantity* in sacrifice than Cain. In reference to which the learned Grotius remarks, *in loco*, that the sense of this text, according to LXX, was, that Cain did not offer of the best, or else that he gave *a less pro-*

* Clem. Rom. Ep. ad. Cor. n. 4.
† Irenæus Contra Hæres, iv, 18. Paris, 1710.
‡ Adv. Judæos, n. 2. London, 1689. p. 185.

portion than the tenth, which from the most ancient ages was the portion due to GOD.*

Next we might quote the case of Job, who lived before the Mosaic law, and is said, by authors of the greatest credit among the Jews, to have paid tithes.

But, as it is not mentioned in Scripture, we pass to the case of Abraham. Here, as the sacred history branches out into more particular detail, we find, as might be expected, the exact proportion mentioned. The account of it as given in Gen. xiv, is, that as Abraham returned from the slaughter of the four kings, he was met by Melchizedek, who "was the priest of the Most High GOD," and who blessed him, and said, blessed be Abraham of the Most High GOD, possessor of Heaven and Earth; and blessed be the Most High GOD, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him *tithes of all.* In speaking of this event St. Paul, (Heb. vii,) to show how this related to the times of the Gospel, paraphrases the history, applying it to our Saviour's priesthood. And, what is more important to our subject, his whole argument is based on the fact that Melchizedek received this tithe from Abram not as a mere gratuity or free gift, but as a tribute due to him, as a priest of the Most High GOD. We merely add in passing, that Comber thinks that there is good reason to suppose that Abram frequently received Melchizedek's prayers and blessing, and annually paid to him as GOD'S priest tithes of all his increase.

Next, we have the case of Jacob. Brought up according to the religious rites of his forefather Abraham, he was, perhaps, from his youth, accustomed to the practice of paying the tithe. Having left his father's house, in search of a wife, as his father had charged him, he lights on a place called Haran, and while he tarries there all night, the LORD appears unto him. Awaking in the morning, he vowed a vow, saying, "If GOD will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace; then shall the LORD be my GOD; and this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be GOD'S house; and of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give *the tenth* unto Thee." GOD had just confirmed to him all the promises that he had made to Abraham, and as the heir of his blessings, he is ready to copy his piety. We have in this short history plainly declared, first, his faith, the LORD shall be *his* GOD; secondly, his devotion, he builds a house of GOD; thirdly, his

* "Non sui generis optima, aut certi minus decima, quæ ab antiquissimis seculis Dei portio."

devotes a tithe of all that he ever shall have. his tithe to the priest to acknowledge that of Heaven and Earth; Jacob gives it to all that he hath. We know that there are that this was a mere vow on Jacob's part, But they should remember that at the same to make the LORD his GOD; and we hope no the LORD was not his GOD before. On the con- opinion that the fact of the two vows being s a strong evidence that Jacob knew the pay- be a part of the true worship of GOD.

to the Israelites, who, as all will admit, paid, command, one-tenth of all their income for the Priesthood, as a direct act of worship to Al- But as some of our readers may not have ob- ds of the Law, we will briefly mention its pro- The first mention we have of it is in the Book of 29,) where, as was natural from what we have al- to have been the practice among pious people pre- time, it is mentioned not so much to declare it, as as a well known duty: "Thou shalt not delay to first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors." Indeed, have thought that Jacob's vow bound all his posterity. at as it may, it shows, as Grotius observes, that tithes ed by a most ancient custom, of which no beginning

We proceed to examine the Law, we find that the devout required, first of all, to pay every year the first fruits wine, honey, oil, and of all the increase of the field the LORD. "The first of the first fruits of thy land thou bring into the house of the LORD thy GOD."* Next he pay a tithe of all things for the support of the Priest- "All the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the or of the fruit of the tree, is the LORD's: it is holy unto the LORD."† "Behold, I have given the children of Levi all tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congre- ‡ And we may here stop to observe, that the same prescribed that the Levites, using the term as it is constantly in the Old Testament, for the two lower orders of the Jewish Ministry, Priests and Levites, should pay the tenth of their tenth the High Priest.§ "And the LORD spake unto Moses, say-

* Exod. xxiii. 19. and also Numb. xv. 20. Deut. xv. 4. xxvi. 2. 2 Chron. xxxi. 5. Nehem. x. 35.
† Levit. xxvii. 30. ‡ Numb. xviii. 21.
§ Hooker, vii. xxiii. 4. Potter on Church Gov. c. v. p. 377.

g, Thus speak unto the Levites, and say unto them, when ye ke of the children of Israel the tithes which I have given u from them for your inheritance, then ye shall offer up a ave offering of it for the LORD, even a tenth part of the he. And this your heave offering shall be reckoned unto u as though it were the corn of the threshing floor, and as e fullness of the wine press. Thus ye also shall offer an ave offering unto the LORD of all your tithes, which ye re- ive of the children of Israel; and ye shall give thereof the RD's heave offering to Aaron, the Priest."* But to re- n; after the first tithe was taken out, the remaining nine rts appear to have been again tithed, and carried up to be nt in feasts at Jerusalem. It is of this tithe that Moses aks in Deuteronomy, xii, 5, 6, and xiv, 23. Then, in addi- n to these two tithes, there was required every third year a he for the poor. "At the end of three years thou shalt ng forth all the tithes of thine increase the same year, and lt lay it up within thy gates: and the Levite, (because he th no part or inheritance with thee,) and the stranger, and fatherless, and the widow, which are within thy gates, ll come, and shall eat and be satisfied; that the LORD thy D may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou est."† In support of these views Dr. Comber quotes St. rysostom, Epiphanius, and St. Jerome. And Josephus, in Antiquities,‡ puts these words in the mouth of Moses, esides these two tithes which I have already said you are pay every year, the one for the Levites, the other for the tivals, you are to bring every third year a third tithe to be tributed to those that want; to women also that are widows; d to children that are orphans." And in like manner the ok of Tobit, though apocryphal, yet regarded by the Jews th great favor as an instructive manual, and true history of s particular family,§ says, (i, 6–8,) "I, Tobit, alone went en to Jerusalem at the feasts, as it was ordained unto all the ople of Israel by an everlasting decree, having the first fruits d tenths of increase, with that which was first shorn; and m gave I at the altar to the priests, the children of Aaron. e first tenth part of all increase I gave to the sons of Aaron, o ministered at Jerusalem. Another tenth part I sold away, d went, and spent it every year at Jerusalem; and the third ave unto them to whom it was meet, as Debora, my father's other, had commanded me, because I was left an orphan by y father." And futhermore to speak of lesser tributes which

* Numb. xviii, 25–8.
† Deut. xiv, 28, 29.; xxvi, 12.
‡ Lib. c, viii, § 2.
§ Dr. Arnald's Preface.

the priests received from the people by Divine command; they had the first born of every clean beast, the price paid for the redemption of every child and unclean beast;* they had voluntary oblations which the people had vowed to God,† or else the price of their redemption, as well as those which were freely offered without any precedent vow, and the things which remained from the sacrifices. Beside which, lest they should be, in any way, inferior to the idolatrous priesthood of Egypt, who had lands,‡ or should be too much dependent on the people, they had forty-eight cities, with their suburbs, the adjoining territory, set apart for their free and perpetual inheritance.§ So that, to quote the computation of the judicious Hooker, "in a word, if the quality of that which God did assign to His Clergy be considered, and their manner of receiving it, without labor, expense, or charge, it will appear that the tribe of Levi, being but the twelfth part of Israel, had in effect as good as four twelfth parts of all such goods as the holy land did yield; so that their worldly estate was four times as good as any other tribe's in Israel besides. But the High Priests' condition, how ample! to whom belonged the tenth of all the tithes of this land, especially the law providing also, that as the people did bring the best of all things unto the Priests and Levites, so the Levites should deliver the choice and flower of all their commodities to the High Priest, and so his tenth part by that means be made the very best part amongst ten; by which proportion, if the Levites were ordinarily in all not above thirty thousand men, (whereas when David numbered them, he found almost thirty-eight thousand above the age of thirty years,) the High Priest, after his very reckoning, had as much as three or four thousand others of the Clergy to live upon.‖

Or to take a calculation made by Dr. Comber, to show the proportion which each Jew necessarily paid of his income to the support of the Church and the poor, we will suppose a case of his entire crop, amounting to an annual yield of 6000 ephahs.

1. From this he had to deduct the corners of the field unreaped, by custom, a sixtieth part,	Ephahs,	100
2. The first fruits (divided into *Bicurim* and *Theru-mah*) about a thirtieth part, ...		175
3. Then from what remained, the first or Levites' tithe,		572
4. The tithe for feasts, ...		515
Total,		1362

* Numb. xviii, 18. † Numb. xviii, 8–9; Levit. xxvii, 11, 14. ‡ Gen. xlvii, 22. § Numb. xxxv, 7; Josh. xiv, 4. Potter on Church Gov., p. 377. ‖ Eccles. Pol., VII, xxiii, 4.

Which deducted from the 6000 ephahs, leaves in the ordinary year only 4638 ephahs for his own private use.

Then if we deduct the tithe of the poor taken every third year, 463 ephahs, he had in that year, which was especially called "the year of tithing," only 4175 ephahs for his private use. So that in ordinary years, the devout Israelite paid *more than a fifth*, and every third year *more than a fourth* of his entire increase or income to the service of the temple and the support of the poor. And then our readers will observe that we have made no mention of the fact that every seventh year, the fields were to be left untilled to produce spontaneously for the poor, and every debt remitted.*

But to pass on, without any remarks, at present, upon this Divinely ordained system, to the Gospel times,—the last dispensation, the substance of which all that went before was but the shadow,—let us examine the rule which then prevailed. Here, we think, we hear the objector claim, you will find nothing of tithes, it was a carnal ordinance, one of the burdens of the Mosaic law, which was done away by the freedom and superior light of the Gospel. The objection, however, proceeds on the strange mistake, that no part of the Law is in force, but what is commanded anew in the Gospel. Whereas we may with much more propriety say, that every part of the Law is still in force, which is not abrogated in the Gospel. The Gospel was not intended to do away with the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfill them. And we may throw the burden of proof on the objector, and say, tithes *are* still in force, because you can bring no evidence that they have been done away. The argument is a sound one, and we believe unanswerable. The tithe was no more a special enactment of the Jewish Law than the Sabbath. The reason of it is eternal. It began when man first became dependent on God for his daily bounties, and must last as long as man remains on earth.

But, we have more than negative proof. Our Lord not only did not forbid tithes, but He gave His express approbation of them. In His rebuke of the Pharisees† He said, "*These* (i. e. the paying tithe of the smallest things, mint, anise, and cummin) *ought ye to have done.*" It was their duty as an act of devotion to God to dedicate and give the tithe to Him. If you reply that this was a rule only for the Pharisees, we reply that Christ would never have prescribed that for the Pharisees which He would not have His disciples also do; for it was His constant lesson to them, "Your righteousness must exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees."

* Ex. xxiii, 10, 11; Deut. xv, 1, 2. † St. Matthew xxiii, 23.

In confirmation of this, we have the Apostle's argument in that striking chapter, the seventh of the Epistle to the Hebrews. He is arguing for the superiority of the Priesthood of our LORD over the Jewish. And he does it on the ground, that they, receiving tithes, died, but He ever liveth receiving them. If, therefore, tithing were to be done away under the Christian Dispensation, where were the force of the Apostle's argument?

Again, in writing to Timothy, the Bishop of Ephesus, and giving him directions for the guidance of the Church, he says, "Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine."* The passage clearly alludes to the double portion which the elder brothers received, who were the Priests of the family. And St. Jerome quotes it to prove that the Ministers of the Gospel have a right to tithes.†

Again the Apostle writes to the Galatians‡ on the subject, "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things;" which, to take Beza's§ explanation of it, is, "Let him give him a part of all his goods." How could the Apostle more expressly declare that a share of every kind of worldly goods must be set apart for the Ministers of GOD? And then he goes on to argue the point, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Which seems as much as to say—to spend all our worldly goods without giving a part of them to the purposes of religion, is to mock GOD, and to provoke him to withhold his blessings from us; if we provide but for the flesh, things of this world, we shall perish with our worldly estates, but what we provide for spiritual things shall be reaped in everlasting life.

But, if these texts do not seem as clear as they might, there is yet one, whose force cannot be evaded, in which St. Paul asserts, in the most positive manner, *his right*, as a Minister of CHRIST, to claim support in the same manner, and on the same principle as the priests of the Jewish Church. His argument is of the most logical and conclusive nature. First of all he appeals (he is writing to the Corinthians) to their natural sense of right and justice: "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of

* 1 Timothy, v, 17. † Comment on Mal. iii, Paris, 1602, p. 642. ‡ vi, 6.
§ Beza, *in loco*, "Quasi dicas ex omnibus bonis suis: sicut in vernaculo sermone dicimus, *De tous ses biens.*"

the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?"* Then he refers to the well-known principle of the Law, "It is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn;" and urges that unanswerable conclusion, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" But this is not all. We have higher grounds than this to take. "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the LORD ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." The passage is very strong: "*Even so hath the* LORD ORDAINED," (διέταξε,) i. e. *appointed, commanded*, as an order given to a servant or a soldier, for so is the word frequently translated in other parts of the New Testament. The argument is not to be evaded. GOD intended and commands that Christian Ministers should have the same support, "*even so*" as the Jewish Priesthood. As He demanded from the Israelites a tenth of their income for the support of His Priesthood then, so now does He demand from Christians a tenth of their income for the support of the Ministry of the New Testament. And they are to give it, not as though it were a free-will offering, or a matter of charity, but as GOD's right, and His express command. But lest we may be thought by some to claim more than the text will warrant, we shall simply add the comments upon it of two men, the mere mention of whose names will give it all the weight that we can desire; the one the author of the immortal work on Ecclesiastical Polity, and the other one of the most acute reasoners that the Church of England ever possessed. "The plain ordinance of CHRIST," says Hooker, explaining the passage,† "appointeth as large and as ample proportion out of His own treasure unto them that serve Him in the Gospel as ever the Priests of the Law did enjoy. What further can we desire? It is the blessed Apostle's testimony, that '*even so* the LORD hath ordained.'"

"But what was it that the LORD ordained? (writes the Rev. Charles Leslie,) that every man should pay what he pleased? That they might do, and that they would do, without any order or law made for it. Was there ever such a law made, that every man should do just what he pleased, and no more? Would not such a law be good for just nothing? that is to say, it would be no law; for law is a requiring and enjoining something, a restraining of liberty, and putting men under an obligation, who were free before, as to that which the law commands; and therefore that which lays no restraint or obligation, but leaves every man perfectly to his own liberty, is no law; and, consequent-

* I Cor. ix, 7, 9, 13, 14.

† Eccles. Pol., VII, xxiii, 6.

ly, if every man were left to his liberty what he pleased to give to the Gospel, then CHRIST here ordained just nothing; it was no ordinance or law at all; and there was no manner of comparison betwixt the Gospel and the Altar, which the Apostle does compare together. The LORD ordained tithes to the Altar, and nothing to the Gospel. What comparison then betwixt the Gospel and the Altar? The same as betwixt tithes and nothing! And how then did the LORD ordain a maintenance for the Ministers of the Gospel, *even so* as for the Ministers of the Altar.

"There is no coherence, no argument, no comparison, nor good sense, can be made out of this text, unless the LORD had ordained, that as the tithes were paid to the priests of the temple, they should be likewise paid to the priests of the Gospel. And then the comparison lies full and round, and the Apostle's argument is strong and cogent, which otherwise is precarious and inconsequential. Therefore I think that from this very text it may, nay, that it must be concluded, that the LORD has ordained tithes under the Gospel as well as under the Law. And I will show hereafter that this text was thus understood in the first ages of the Church."*

From this we pass to the last point in our argument, the testimony and practice of the Primitive Church. And here it is not surprising that among the earliest writers we do not find tithes specifically mentioned any more than we do in the New Testament; for it were simply absurd for men to be exhorting others to pay tithes, when they were in the constant habit of giving a quarter, a half, and often the whole of their income.† Nevertheless, we do find, even among the earliest writers, passages which show their belief in the principle. Our limits will but allow us to refer to a few of the most important to sustain what we have said.

IRENÆUS, who lived scarcely one hundred years after the death of St. John, says: "We ought to offer to GOD the first fruits of His creatures;" and shortly after adds, "The Jews for this cause had their tenths consecrated, but those who have received liberty, i. e. Christians, have dedicated all they have to God's service cheerfully and freely, not giving that which is less than the Jews, inasmuch as they have a better hope."‡

ORIGEN, who lived but a little later, writes: "The number ten is venerable also in the New Testament; and because there is one Author of all, and the beginning and the end is CHRIST, therefore the people offer tithes to the Ministers and

---

* Essay on Tithes, § 9, pp. 245, 6.

† "So liberal," admits even the opponent Selden, "in the beginning of Christianity was the devotion of the believers, that their bounty to the Evangelical Priesthood far exceeded what the tenth could have been."—p. 86.

‡ "Offere igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creaturæ." "Et propter hoc illi quidam decimas suorum habebant consecratas: qui autem perceperunt libertatem, omnia quæ sunt ipsorum ad dominicos decernunt usus, hilariter et libere dantes ea, non quæ sunt minora, utpote majorum spem habentes."—*Contra Hæres*, iv, 34. Paris, 1710, p. 250.

Priests, the first to the first born of every creature, and the beginnings to the beginning of all."*

St. Cyprian, but a little later still, after showing how the Levites by God's ordinance were so provided for, as never to be hindered, by secular affairs, from attending on their ministry adds, "which method and form is now observed among the Clergy, so that they who are promoted in the Church of Christ to Holy Orders, should not be taken off from Divine administration, nor be entangled with secular troubles and business—receiving as it were tithes of fruits—might never be taken off from the Altar and Sacrifices, but day and night minister in heavenly and spiritual things."†

We only add two more of the next century:

St. Chrysostom in one of his Homilies writes: "For what did not they (the Jews) of old do? They gave tithes, and tithes again upon tithes. They supported orphans, widows, and strangers; whereas some one was saying to me in astonishment at another, 'Why, such an one gives tithes.' What a load of disgrace does this expression imply, that a matter which with the Jews was no matter of surprise, that this should have been surprising with Christians! If there was danger then in omitting tithes, think how great it must be now."‡—*Hom. on Ephes.*, IV, *Library of the Fathers*, V, 145. Oxford, 1840.

And St. Ambrose, in a sermon for the season of Lent, "Whoso remembers he hath not faithfully paid his tithes, let him now amend what he omitted. What is it to pay tithes faithfully, but that you never offer the worst nor the least to God, either of your corn, wine, fruit of trees, of cattle, or of your garden, your merchandise, and your hunting. Of all the substance which God hath given a man, he hath reserved a tenth part to Himself; therefore it is not lawful to retain that which God hath reserved to himself. God will take away the

---

* "Sed et in Novo Testamento similiter venerabilis et decus—verum quia unus autor est omnium, et finis et initium unus est Christus, idcirco et populus decimas quidem ministris et sacerdotibus præstat, primogenita vero offert primogenito omnis creaturæ, et initia in initio omnium."—*Hom. in Gen.* xvi, Vol. II, p. 105. Paris, 1733.

† "Quæ nunc ratio et forma in clero tenetur, ut qui in Ecclesia Domini, ordinationi clerica promoventur, in nullo ab administratione Divina avocentur; nec molestiis et negotiis secularibus alligentur, tanquam decimas ex fructibus accipientur, ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant, sed die ac nocte celestibus rebus et spiritualibus serviam."—*Cyprian*, Ep. I, p. 2. Oxon. 1682.

‡ "Nam quid illi non faciebant? Decimas et rursus decimas, præbebant orphanis, viduis, proselytis, sed mihi quidam de quopiam dicebat, hic aut ille dat decimas. Quanto est hoc plenumprobo et dedicore, sic quod apud Judæos non habebatur in admirationi, hoc apud Christianos factum est admirabile! Si tunc erat periculum decimas non relinquere, cogita quantum nunc sit." p. 196. Paris, 1686.

[illegible] him not the tenth; and he that restore[s] [illegible]ously got from God, that man neither fear[s] [illegible] true repentance and confession means."[1] [illegible] fuller quotations from these and othe[r] [illegible]er, Selden, and in Bingham's Christian Anti[q] [illegible] To extend the *catena* of testimony furthe[r] [illegible]yond our limits, but needless, as from thi[s] [illegible] Fathers are voluminous on the subject, an[d] [illegible] Church were frequent in requiring tithe[s] [illegible]nder pain of excommunication. So that t[o] [illegible]:

[illegible] the Fathers about this time, we should be forced t[o] [illegible]eating the Divine right of tithes. None will deny [illegible] and express for tithes at that time, and afterwards [illegible] were not so large, because they did not treat expressly o[f] [illegible] and by the by, having no occasion for it while the zea[l] [illegible] willing to be stinted to the bare due of a tenth, but gave [illegible] were not strange if we had heard nothing at all from [illegible] good providence they have left sufficient to convince those [illegible] after-ages, who through covetousness and distrust o[f] [illegible] their tithes; till, by a long custom of sinning, men [illegible] to sense of their sin, who yet durst not plead for the lawfulness [illegible] to ease of those careless and diffident Christians, who at [illegible] pay their tithes, then forebore it; and at last forgot it; [illegible] most corrupt times to dispute against it." Essay, § 10.

We now one thing more, and we have done with our argu[ment] [illegible] of the dedication of the tenth. We have re[served] [illegible] to the last, because we would use it only as collateral [illegible] and as corroborative of what we have already said. [illegible] the universal observance of this rule among all the [illegible] of the world. Yet at the same time we might [illegible] such universal usage is proof, either that they re[ceived] [illegible] from some primitive tradition, probably before the dis[persion] [illegible], and so it was based on a Divine command, or [illegible] founded on an innate belief in its fitness, implant[ed] [illegible] by God, and so also Divine in its origin. Hence we [find] [illegible] Selden has taken great pains to overthrow the force [of] [illegible] arguments by disputing the truth of the examples which [have] [illegible] adduced. But that he failed in this, as well as the [other] [illegible] arguments and facts that he has attempted to bring against [the] [illegible] right of tithes, we have his own evidence. In 1618 [he] [illegible] appeared before the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop [of] [illegible], London, and Rochester, and three doctors o[f] [illegible] Civil Law, sitting judicially, and made this submissio[n] [illegible] his own hand: "My Good Lords, I most humbly

[1] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Quadrag. Vide item. Serm. de Ascen[s] [illegible] Chemnitz, p. 70.

acknowledge my error which I have committed in publishing the *History of Tithes*, and especially in that I have at all by showing any interpretation of Holy Scripture, by meddling with Councils, Fathers, or Canons, or by what else soever occurs in it, offered any occasion of argument against any right of maintenance, *Jure Divino*, of the Ministers of the Gospel; beseeching your Lordships to receive this humble and ingenuous acknowledgment, together with the unfeigned protestation of my grief, for that through it I have so incurred both his Majesties and your Lordship's displeasure, conceived against me in behalf of the Church of England."

The evidence of this custom is so voluminous that it would be utterly impossible to crowd it into the limits of such an Article. We must therefore content ourselves with stating, that the practice of devoting the tenth of all to their false gods, is to be found among the Arabians, the Ethiopians, the Carthagenians, the Greeks and Romans, at different periods in their history, and in England before it became Christian. The Grecian army under Xenophon, in its remarkable retreat after the death of Cyrus, reserved a tenth of their money, to be dedicated to Apollo at Delphi, and Diana at Ephesus. Sylla, the Roman general, dedicated the tenth of all his estate to Hercules; and Plutarch adds, that this was a constant custom at Rome.* So that we may naturally fear, if these, who were led merely by some obscure tradition or the light of nature, performed this duty with such exactness, and we who have the practice of the primitive patriarchs, the Divine command of the Jewish law, not yet repealed, the continuance of it in the New Testament, and the custom of the early Christians, as well as the example of these Gentiles, shall fail to do it, they shall one day rise up in the judgment against us and condemn us.

The principle, then, which we think this brief examination has established, is just this: that every devout Christian is bound, by God's requirement, to give, at the least, one tenth of his income, or the annual increase which God grants to his labor and property, for the uses of the Church. And this beyond and beside what he is called upon as a Christian man to do for his poorer brethren, or his heart may prompt him for any special mercy to devote as a thank-offering to his Lord. For what particular purpose, or in what particular channel it should be given, may not be so clear; though we have our own notion, and we think not without warrant in the Word of God,

* Archbishop Potter on Church Government.

that those who are over us in the LORD, and watch for our souls as they that must give account, are the best and most proper almoners of our bounty. And we are of opinion that there is no better way for the collection, and offering up of this portion of our worldly goods which GOD has lent us, than the weekly offertory, which we much wish were in general use throughout the Church. But of this we can merely throw out a hint, having neither the opportunity nor the inclination, at the end of an Article, to enter on the discussion of so important a question to the practical working of the Church.

But, we are told, this theory may all be very good on paper—it may be all right—and what we ought to do—but yet the people will not conform to it, the mass will not give on any systematic plan. They certainly will not until they are taught. And, we say it with all due deference, we do think that our clergy, we believe from mistaken notions of modesty, have not been as careful as they ought in instructing their people on this point. From some cause this is the one subject on which their lips seem to be forever sealed. As though it were sacrilegious to speak of the Church's money in the pulpit; or as though it were indelicate and offensive to allude to so unpopular a subject; or as though any man could declare the whole counsel of GOD, who neglects anything which the HOLY SPIRIT hath taught.

Again, we are told it is too much. One tenth is more than men can afford. It would drive some into poverty. We might reply, and there leave it, who knows best, GOD, or sinful, covetous man? Can man *afford* to rob GOD? Dare we, with all our blessings and boasted wealth, set up the plea and say that we are less able to give than the poor Jew, and the despised heathen? But we have more than this. We do not hesitate to say that this objection could not come from one whose heart was wholly given to GOD.* Any rule will be

* It may not be unimportant to record, in this connection, the practice of some of the more eminently pious men of modern times. Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice of England; the Rev. Dr. Hammond, the commentator; the Rev. Dr. Annesley, the grandfather of John Wesley; Richard Baxter, the Author of the Saints Rest; and the Rev. Dr. Doddridge, and others, regularly gave at least a *tenth*. Archbishop Tillotson and Dr. Watts, a fifth, and Mrs. Rowe, the author of "Pious Exercises," one-half. John Wesley even a larger proportion. And the eminent Mrs. Elizabeth Bury, having no children, a fourth. To these might easily be added many others. We only quote one out of many recent instances, recorded in the little work on the "Divine Law of Beneficence." A distinguished layman writes, "I have practised it for several years, and found a blessing in it. It is GOD's own plan, and therefore, better than any other. So every one will find it, who will but try. I am one of the witnesses for GOD, that in *this* matter, as in all others, He is good.'"

pressive to those who give not willingly, but of necessity. ith itself is oppressive to those who delight in falsehood. d this, or any other requirement of the Gospel, demanding f-denial, will be too much for one who has not faith. God uires us to put our whole trust in Him, and only so is the es pleasant, or even tolerable. But trusting in Him, we ll be the gainers by it. The one tenth, given in faith, will ctify and multiply the whole; but withheld, in distrust, will ink and shrivel all the rest. "Ye are cursed with a curse: ye have robbed Me, (in tithes and offerings,) even this ole nation," are the words of the prophet Malachi. "Bring all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in ne house, and prove Me now herewith, saith the Lord of sts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour u out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to re- ve it. And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall ur vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the RD of hosts. And all nations shall call you blessed: for ye ll be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of hosts."* Again, Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits all thine increase: so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, d thy presses shall burst out with new wine."† And again, the book of Ecclesiasticus,‡ though not canonical, yet read : "example of life and instruction of manners," "Give the RD His honor with a good eye, and diminish not the first its of thine hands. In all thy gifts show a cheerful coun- ance, and dedicate thy tithes with gladness. Give unto the ost High, according as He hath enriched thee; and as thou st gotten, give with a cheerful eye. For the Lord recom- nseth, and will give thee seven times as much." All of ich is more than borne out by the declarations of the New stament. What can be stronger than those striking words, It is more blessed to give than to receive;" or more positive d certain than that direction and promised blessing of St. ul, read at our offertory, "Charge them who are rich in this rld, that they be ready to give, and glad to distribute; lay- g up in store for themselves a good foundation against the ne to come, that they may attain eternal life." Paying the he, therefore, is not to our loss, but to our present and eter- l gain. God bids us prove Him—try Him, and see whether is not so. And if we will not trust Him with a tenth Who ve us all, how can we complain if He takes from us all that

---

* Mal. iii, 9–12. † Prov. iii, 9, 10. ‡ Eccl. xxxv, 8–11.

He has entrusted us with? So that we cannot be far from right, when we say, that the man who is convinced of his duty in this respect, and yet does it not, must have some covetousness lurking about his heart, which leads him to rest on human means and his own exertions for his prosperity in this world, rather than on the promises of the Lord of hosts—to walk by sight and not by faith.

May we not therefore conclude, in the words of the judicious Hooker, after he had summed up the provision that God made for His priesthood under the elder dispensation,

"God, by way of special preëminence, has undertaken to feed the clergy at His own table, and out of His own proper treasury to maintain them, that want and penury they might never feel, except God Himself did first receive injury. A thing most worthy of our consideration is the wisdom of God herein; for the common sort being prone unto envy and murmur, little considereth of what necessity, use, and importance the sacred duties of the clergy are, and for that cause hardly yieldeth them any such honor without repining and grudging thereat; they cannot brook it, that when they have labored and come to reap, there should so great a portion go out of the fruit of their labors, and be yielded up unto such as sweat not for it. But when the Lord doth challenge this as His own due, and require it to be done by way of homage unto Him whose mere liberality and goodness had raised them from a poor and servile estate, to place them where they had all those ample and rich possessions; they must be worse than brute beasts, if they would storm at any thing which He did receive at their hands, and for Him to bestow His own on His own servants, (which liberty is not denied unto the meanest of men,) what man liveth that can think it other than most reasonable? Wherefore no cause there was, why that which the clergy had should in any man's eye seem too much, unless God Himself were thought to be of an over-having disposition."*

* VII, xxiii, 4, 5.

Art. V.—IMPRISONMENT AND PETITION OF BISHOP SEABURY.

The following curious document has never before been published. It is the Petition of the Rev. Samuel Seabury, to the General Assembly of Connecticut, in December, 1775, complaining of the unjust and illegal cruelties inflicted upon him. It appears that a letter was also received by the General Assembly of Connecticut from the President of the New York Congress on the subject, which letter we have not been able to find.

That Bishop Seabury was thus imprisoned and mal-treated on account of his religion, we think admits of no question. There is certainly no breach of charity in such a supposition, when we consider the intolerance of the Puritan Laws of Connecticut, and the undeniable fact that persons were fined and imprisoned for no other crime than that of being Churchmen. Here are specimens of the Colonial Laws of Connecticut:

"This Court orders that henceforth no persons in this Jurisdiction shall in any way embody themselves into Church estate, without consent of the General Court and approbation of the neighboring Churches." 1657.—(Trumbull's Colonial Records of Connecticut. 1636–1655. p. 311.)

"This Court orders that there shall be no ministry or Church administration by the inhabitants of any plantation in this Colony, distinct and separate from, and in opposition to, that which is openly and publicly observed, and dispensed by the settled and approved minister of the place, except it be by approbation of the General Court and neighboring Churches."—1657. (Ib. p. 311.)

For behaving contemptuously "towards the word preached or the messengers thereof"—it was ordered—"And if a second time they break forth into the like contemptuous carriages, they shall either pay five pounds to the public treasure, or stand two hours openly upon a block or stool, four foot high, upon a lecture day, with a paper fixed on his breast, written with capital letters, An open and obstinate contemner of God's holy ordinances."—1650. (Ib. p. 524.)

"It is ordered and decreed by this Court, and authority thereof, that wheresoever the ministry of the word is established, according to the order of the Gospel throughout this jurisdiction, every person shall duly resort and attend thereunto respectively upon the Lord's day, and upon such public fast days, and days of Thanksgiving, as are to be generally kept by the appointment of authority. And if any person within this jurisdiction, shall, without just and necessary cause, withdraw himself from hearing the public ministry of the word, after due means of conviction used, he shall forfeit for his absence from every such public meeting, five shillings."—(Ib. p. 524.)

For the support of this Puritan establishment, it was ordered as follows,—"And do order that those who are taught in the word, in the several plantations be called together, that every man voluntarily set down what he is willing to allow to that end and use: And if any man refuse to pay a meet proportion, that then he be rated by authority in some just and equal way; and if, after this, any man withhold or delay due payment, *the civil power to be exercised as in other just debts.*"—(Ib. p. 545.)

How these laws should have been binding on the Rev. Mr Seabury, who, for many years, had been, and then was, an in habitant of another Colony, is another question.

The Hon. Mr. Seward, of the U. S. S., lately delivered a glowing eulogium upon the Early Puritans of Massachusetts at the recent "Plymouth Rock" celebration, in which he em phatically commended them for their establishment of "Fre Toleration in Religion." Mr. Seward's language is, for w would not do him an injustice: "The Puritans thus persiste and prevailed, because they had adopted one true, singula and sublime principle of civil conduct, namely, *that the sul ject in every State has a natural right to liberty of conscience.*" And again he says—and it is a strange compound of irrever ence and absurdity—"*The Puritans came into the world t save it from despotism; and the world comprehended them not.*" ! !

Thus far Mr. Seward. Now let us see what these Puritan in Massachusetts really meant by this "natural right to libert of conscience." Their Laws certainly are a fair expression o their opinions and principles on this point. Here are specimens

"It is ordered that henceforth no man shall be admitted to the freedom o this Commonwealth, but such as are members of some of the Churches withi the limits of this Commonwealth." May, 1631.—(Mass. Bay Col. Laws, Ch. xli Sec. i.)

"It is therefore ordered by this Court, and the authority thereof, that wh soever shall be found observing any such day as Christmas or the lik either by forbearing labor, feasting, or any other way, upon any such accoun as aforesaid, every such person so offending, shall pay for every such offens five shillings, as a fine to the County."—(Ib. Ch. 1, Sect. 2d.)

"This Court doth order and enact that every person or persons of the *cursed sect* of the Quakers, who is not an inhabitant of, but found within this jurisdi tion, shall be apprehended (without warrant, where no Magistrate is at hand by any Constable, Commissioner, or Selectman, and conveyed from Constab to Constable, until they come before the next Magistrate, who shall commit th said person or persons to close prison, there to remain without bail until th next Court of Assistants; where they shall have a legal trial by a special jur and being convicted to be of the sect of the Quakers, shall be sentenced to ba ishment upon pain of death."

"Every inhabitant of this jurisdiction, being convicted to be of the afor said sect, * * * and refusing to retract and reform the aforesaid opinio and practices, shall be sentenced to banishment upon pain of death."—(Ib. C li., Sec. 9.)

The method of executing the banishment was as follows:

The Quaker was to be "directed to the Constable of the town wherein h *or she*, is taken, or in absence of the Constable to any other meet person, l stripped naked from the middle upwards, and tied to a cart's tail, and whipp through the town, and from thence immediately conveyed to the Constable the next town towards the borders of our jurisdiction, as their warrant sha direct; and so from Constable to Constable, till they be conveyed through an the outwardmost towns of our jurisdiction."—1661. (Col. Laws. Ch. li, Sec. 10

We may add that this law was soon after made much more intolerable. "Any Quaker, after the first conviction, if a man, was to lose one ear, and the second time the other; if a woman, each time to be severely whipped; and the third time, *man or woman, to have their tongues bored through with a red hot iron.*" —(Haliburton's Rule and Misrule, p. 102.)

Hildreth also gives an account of "the young husband of one of them, following the cart to which his wife was tied, and from time to time interposing his hat between her naked and bleeding back and the lash of the executioner!"—(Hildreth's United States, vol. i, p. 473.)

"And if after this, *he or she* shall return again, then to be proceeded against as incorrigible rogues and enemies to the common peace, and shall immediately be apprehended and committed to the common gaol of the country, and at the next Court of Assistants, shall be brought to their trial, and proceeded against according to the law made Anno. 1658, for their punishment on pain of death." —(Col. Laws, Ch. li, Sec. 2.)

"It is therefore ordered and decreed by this Court, that if any Christian within this jurisdiction shall go about to subvert and destroy the Christian faith and religion, by broaching and maintaining any damnable heresy, as denying * * * that Christ gave himself a ransom for our sins, * * * every such person continuing obstinate therein, after due means of conviction, shall pay to the common treasurer, during the first six months, twenty shillings a month, and for the next six months, forty shillings per month, and so to continue during his obstinacy."—(Ib. Ch. li. Sec. 13.)

"It is ordered and enacted by authority of this Court, that no Jesuit, or spiritual, or ecclesiastical person, (as they are termed,) ordained by the authority of the Pope, or see of Rome, shall henceforth at any time repair to, or come within this jurisdiction; and if any person shall give just cause of suspicion, that he is one of such society or order, he shall be brought before some of the Magistrates, and if he cannot free himself of such suspicion, he shall be committed to prison, or bound over to the next Court of Assistants, to be tried and proceeded with, by banishment or otherwise, as the Court shall see cause.

And if any person so banished, be taken the second time within this jurisdiction, upon lawful trial and conviction, *he shall be put to death.*"—(Ib. Ch. liv.)

We cannot but be surprised that the Hon. Mr. Seward allowed himself to give utterance to such opinions concerning the *toleration* of the Puritans. It was an easy matter for him to lend his influence to banish the Bible from the Common Schools of New York, in 1841, and so to play into the hands of a man who calls himself "Archbishop Hughes." It may be an easy matter, now, to praise the Puritans at "Plymouth Rock" for virtues which they publicly repudiated. Hutchinson says, "*Toleration was preached against as a sin in rulers*, which would bring down the judgments of Heaven upon the land." (Hutchinson, Vol. I, p. 75.) But we do think it high time that even the warmest eulogists of Puritanism, should begin to pay some little regard to historical fidelity. We do think it high time, that they who write and they who speak, of

the early history of our country, should take a broader and truer view; and remember that there was a Church of England element, as well as a Puritan element, at work in the moulding of our National Institutions—that there was a "Jamestown" in 1607, as well as a "Plymouth Rock," in 1620—that there was a GEORGE WASHINGTON, as well as a JOHN ADAMS. And, if comparisons must be drawn, we are willing to leave it to the verdict of the future to decide which of those two elements was noblest and most patriotic in its character; and which of those two men—the representatives of those two elements—really deserves to be regarded as "first in War, first in Peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Let the due meed of praise be cheerfully awarded to each. But this perpetual and overstrained self-laudation on the part of the Puritans, and their attempts to monopolize all the glory of our American Free Institutions, are as ridiculous as they are unjust.

The article in a late *Edinburgh Review* on "The Fathers of New England," is a signal proof of the change in public sentiment as to the character of those men. Twenty years ago, that Article would have been scouted all over New England. Now, it is received in silence, for everybody knows it is true. The reign of New England historical humbuggery is almost over. Mr. Seward's stale platitudes are already behind the times. His picture of Puritanism in England we may take occasion to examine hereafter.

There is still another reason why we believe that the Rev. Mr. Seabury was persecuted for the sake of his religion. The well-laid plot of the Anti-Episcopal clergy of the Colonies, previous to the Revolution, to prevent the introduction of Bishops, and so to render impossible the growth and spread of the Church in this country, may be seen in the recently printed "Minutes of the Convention of Delegates from the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, and the Associations of Connecticut, 1766 to 1775," a particular account of which was given in the *Church Review*, Vol. IV, for January, 1852. The issue made by these men was, "Send us Bishops, and we will raise the standard of revolt."

That Bishop Seabury was not thus persecuted in Connecticut for his *political* opinions, is certain also from the fact, that he shared those opinions with large numbers of Presbyterians and Congregationalists all over the country. Thus, in Massachusetts, in all the Eastern and most thickly settled portions of the State, *a majority of the Congregational clergy were Tories.* This fact we have from a venerable Congregational clergyman, a

distinguished historian, who has given to this point his special attention.

It is a striking event in the Providence of GOD, that the Rev. SAMUEL SEABURY, thus the victim of persecution in Connecticut, should have been afterwards made the first Bishop of that very State, and that his name will ever stand at the head of that long Succession of those whom GOD has raised, and will raise up, as leaders of His Sacramental Host in this country.

The petition, and the documents following, are copied from the MSS. State Papers of Connecticut, by CHARLES J. HOADLEY, Esq., who is connected with the State Department.

From the MSS. State Papers of Connecticut.—(Revolutionary War. Vol. I, doc. 436.)

To the Honorable General Assembly of the Gov. and Company of the Colony of Connecticut, now sitting in New Haven, in said Colony, by special order of his Honor the Governor.

The Memorial of Samuel Seabury, Clerk, A. M., Rector of the parish of West Chester, in the County of West Chester and Province of New York, humbly showeth:

That on Wednesday, the 22d day of November last, your memorialist was seized, at a house in West Chester where he taught a Grammar School, by a company of armed men, to the number, as he supposes, of about forty; that after being carried to his own house and being allowed time to send for his horse, he was forced away on the road to Kingsbridge, but soon meeting another company of armed men they joined and proceeded to East Chester:

That a person styled Captain Lothrop ordered your memorialist to be seized. That after the two Companies joined, the command appeared to your memorialist to be in Captain Isaac Sears, and the whole number of men to be about one hundred:—That from East Chester your memorialist, in company with Jonathan Fowler, Esq., of East Chester, and Nathl. Underhills, Esq., of West Chester, was sent under a guard of about twenty armed men to Horseneck, and on the Monday following, was brought to this town and carried in triumph through a great part of it, accompanied by a large number of men on horseback and in carriages, chiefly armed. That the whole Company arranged themselves before the house of Captain Sears: That after firing two cannon and huzzaing, your memorialist was sent under a guard of four or five men to the house of Mrs. Lyman, where he has ever since been kept under guard. That during this time your memorialist hath been pre-

vented from enjoying a free intercourse with his friends; forbidden to visit some of them, though in company with his guard; prohibited from reading prayers in the Church, and in performing any part of Divine Service, though invited by the Rev. Mr. Hubbard so to do; interdicted the use of pen, ink and paper, except for the purpose of writing to his family, and then it was required that his letters should be examined and licensed before they were sent off; though on Friday last, Captain Sears condescended that your memorialist should be indulged in writing a Memorial to this Hon. Assembly. That your memorialist hath received but one letter from his family since he has been under confinement, and that was delivered to him open, though brought by the post.

Your memorialist begs leave further to represent, that he hath heard a verbal account that one of his daughters was abused and insulted by some of the people when at his house on the 22d of November. That a bayonet was thrust through her cap, and her cap thereby tore from [her] head; That the handkerchief about her neck was pierced by a bayonet, both before and behind, that a quilt in the frame on which the daughters of your memorialist were at work was so cut and pierced with bayonets as to be rendered useless; That while your memorialist was waiting for his horse on the said 22d day of November, the people obliged the wife of your memorialist to open his desk, where they examined his papers, part of the time in presence of your memorialist. That he had in a drawer in the desk three or four dollars and a few pieces of small silver, that he hath heard that only an English shilling and three or four coppers were found in the drawers after he was brought away; That your memorialist thinks this not improbable, as Jonathan Fowler, Esq. informed him that a new beaver hat, a silver mounted horsewhip and two silver spoons, were carried off from his house on said day. Mr. Meloy, also, of this town, informed your memorialist that he, the said Meloy, had been accused by some people of pointing a bayonet at the breast of a daughter of your memorialist, desiring your memorialist to exculpate him from the charge, to which request your memorialist replied that he was not at his house but at his school house, when the affair was said to have happened, but that a daughter of your memorialist met him as he was brought from the school house, and told him that one of the men had pushed a bayonet against her breast and otherwise insulted her; and your memorialist remembers that when he left his house in the morning his daughter had a cap on, but when she met him near the school house, she had none on and her hair was hanging over her shoulders.

Your memorialist, also, begs leave further to represent that after he had been eight or ten days at Newhaven, he was carried by Mr. Jonathan Mix, to whose care he was committed, to the house of Mr. Beers, Innkeeper, in said town, where were Captain Sears, Captain Lothrop, Mr. Brown, and some others, whose names he did not know, or does not recollect; that several questions were asked him, to some of which he gave the most explicit answers, but perceiving some insidious design against him by some of the questions, he refused to answer any more. That Captain Sears then observed to him, if he understood him right, that they did not intend to release him, nor to make such a compromise with him as had been made with Judge Fowler and Mr. Underhill, but to keep him a prisoner till the unhappy disputes between Great Britain and America were settled. That whatever your memorialist might think, what they had done they would take upon themselves and support. That your memorialist then asked an explicit declaration of the charges against him, and was told that the charges against him were:

That he your memorialist had entered into a combination with six or seven others to seize Capt. Sears as he was passing through the county of West Chester, and convey him on board a man-of-war.

That your memorialist had signed a protest at the White-Plains, in the county of West Chester, against the proceedings of the Continental Congress.

That your memorialist had neglected to open his Church on the day of the Continental Fast.

And that he had written pamphlets and newspapers against the Liberties of America.

To the first and last of these charges your Memorialist pleads not guilty, and will be ready to vindicate his innocence as soon as he shall be restored to his liberty in that Province to which only he conceives himself to be amenable. He considers it a high infringement of the liberty for which the virtuous sons of America are now nobly struggling, to be carried by force out of one colony into another for the sake either of trial or imprisonment. Must he be judged by the laws of Connecticut, to which as an inhabitant of New York he owed no obedience? or by the laws of that Colony in which he has been near twenty years a resident? Or, if the regulations of Congress be attended to, must he be dragged from the Committee of his own county and from the Congress of his own Province, cut off from the intercourse of his friends, deprived of the benefit of those evidences which may be necessary for the vindication of his

innocence, and judged by strangers to him, to his character, and to the circumstances of his general conduct in life?

One great grievance justly complained of by the people of America, and which they are now struggling against, is the Act of Parliament directing persons to be carried from America to England for a trial. And your Memorialist is confident that the Supreme Legislative Authority in this Colony will not permit him to be treated in a manner so destructive to that Liberty for which they are now contending. If your Memorialist is to be dealt with according to law, he conceives that the laws of Connecticut, as well as of New York, forbid the imprisonment of his person any otherwise than according to law. If he is to be judged according to the regulations of the Congress, *they* have ordained the Provincial Congress of New York, or the Committee of the County of West Chester, to be his Judges. Neither the laws of either Colony, nor the regulations of the Congress, give any countenance to that mode of treatment which he has met with. But considered in either light, he conceives it must appear *unjust, cruel, arbitrary* and *tyrannical.*

With regard to the second charge, viz: That your Memorialist signed a Protest against the Proceedings of the Congress, he begs leave to state the fact as it really is. The General Assembly of the Province of New York, in their Sessions last winter, determined to send a Petition to the King, a Memorial to the House of Lords, and a Remonstrance to the House of Commons, upon the subject of American grievances; and the members of the House, at least many of them, as your Memorialist was informed, recommended it to their constituents to be quiet till the issue of those applications should be known. Sometime in the beginning of April, as your Memorialist thinks, the people were invited to meet at the White Plains to choose Delegates for a Provincial Congress. Many people there assembled were averse from the measure. They however, gave no other opposition to the choice of delegates than signing a Protest. This Protest your Memorialist signed in company with two members of the Assembly, and above three hundred other people. Your Memorialist had not a thought of acting against the Liberties of America. He did not conceive it to be a crime to support the measures of the Representatives of the people, measures which he then hoped, and expected, would have had a good effect by inducing a change of conduct in regard to America. More than eight months have now passed since your Memorialist signed the Protest. If his crime was of so atrocious a kind, why was he suffered to remain so long unpunished?

or why should he be now singled out from more than three hundred, to endure the unexampled punishment of captivity and unlimited confinement?

The other crime alleged against your Memorialist is that he neglected to open his church on the day of the Continental Fast. To this he begs leave to answer: That he had no notice of the day appointed but from common report. That he received no order relative to said day either from any Congress or Committee. That he cannot think himself guilty of neglecting or disobeying an order of the Congress which order was never signified to him in any way. That a complaint was exhibited against your Memorialist to the Provincial Congress of New York, by Captain Sears, soon after the neglect with which he is charged; and that after the matter was fully debated, the complaint was dismissed. That he conceives it to be *cruel, arbitrary*, and in the highest degree *unjust*, after his supposed offense has been examined before the proper Tribunal, to be dragged like a felon seventy miles from home, and again impeached of the same crime. At this rate of proceeding, should he be acquitted at New Haven, he may be forced seventy miles further, and so on, without end.

Further, your Memorialist begs leave to represent: That he has a wife and six children, to whom he owes both from duty and affection, Protection, Support and Instruction; That his family in a great measure depend, under the Providence of God, upon his daily care for their daily bread; That there are several families at West Chester who depend upon his advice as a physician, to which profession he was bred; That, as a clergyman, he has the care of the towns of East and West Chester; That there is not now a clergyman of any denomination nearer than nine miles from the place of his residence, and but one within that distance without crossing the Sound; so that in his absence there is none to officiate to the people in any religious service, to visit the sick, or bury the dead.

Your Memorialist also begs leave to observe, That in order to discharge some debts which the necessity of his affairs formerly obliged him to contract, he, about a year ago, opened a Grammar School and succeeded so far as to make it worth one hundred pounds York money, for the year past; That he was in a fair way of satisfying his creditors and freeing himself from a heavy incumbrance; That he had five young gentlemen from the Island of Jamaica, one from Montreal, four children of gentlemen now in England committed to his care, among others from New York and the country. That he apprehends his school to be broken up and his scholars dispersed, probably

some of them placed at other schools, and that it may be difficult, if not impracticable, again to recover them. That, if there should be no other impediment, yet if the people of West Chester are to be liable to such treatment as your Memorialist hath lately endured, no person will be willing to trust his children there. That in this case, your Memorialist must lie entirely at the mercy of his creditors to secure him from a jail, or must part with everything he has to satisfy their just demands.

Your Memorialist thinking it his duty to use all lawful and honorable means to free himself from his present confinement, mentioned his case to the Judges of the Superior Court lately sitting in this town. Those honorable gentlemen thought it a case not proper for them to interfere in: he has, therefore, no remedy but in the interposition of the honorable House of Assembly. To them he looks for relief from the heavy hand of oppression and tyranny. He hopes, and expects, that they will dismiss him from his confinement, and grant him their protection, while he passes peaceably through the colony. He is indeed accused of breaking the rules of the Continental Congress. He thinks he can give a good account of his conduct; such as would satisfy reasonable and candid men. He is certain that nothing can be laid to his charge so repugnant to the regulations of the Congress, as the conduct of those people who in an arbitrary and hostile manner forced him from his house, and have kept him now four weeks a prisoner, without any means or prospect of relief. He has a higher opinion of the candor, justice, and equity of the honorable House of Assembly, and should they incline to inquire more minutely into the affair, he would be glad to appear at the bar of their House, and answer for himself; or, to be permitted to have Council to answer for him; or, in such way as they in their wisdom shall think best, to grant him relief. And your Memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

SAMUEL SEABURY.

Dated in New Haven, the 20th day of December, 1775.

Revolutionary War, Vol. I, doc. 437.

In the Lower House, Mr. Burr, Mr. Paine, Mr. Huntington, Mr. Canfield, Col. Fitch, and Col. Williams, are appointed a Committee to confer with such gentlemen as the Honorable Upper House shall appoint, to take into consideration the matters contained in a letter from the President of the Provincial Congress of the Province of New York, to his Honorable the Governor, dated the 12th instant, and read before this House,

consider what is proper to be done thereon, and Report &c.

Test, MICHAEL LAW, *Clerk.*

ıe Upper House, Wm. Samuel Johnson, Esq. is appoint- join the Committee of the Lower House in the affair mentioned.

Test, GEORGE WYLLYS, *Secretary.*

Doc. 438.

Honorable General Assembly:

your Honorable Committee, appointed to take into con- ion the matters contained in a letter from the President Provincial Congress of the Province of New York, &c., ıve to Report, that since our appointment the Rev. Mr. y has presented to this Assembly a Memorial which has ead in the Lower House, and by them put into the hands Committee, in which he prays to be heard by himself or il, particularly stating the matters referred to in the letter he President of the New York Congress, so far as related ı; upon the consideration of which, we apprehend that aring of said Memorial will disclose those facts necessary known in order to give a proper answer to said letter; consider of the requisitions therein contained, are there- f opinion that all parties concerned in said transaction ırd on said Memorial, by themselves or Council, before Houses of Assembly, which we conceive to be most ex- ıt, and probably will give satisfaction to all parties.

Signed per order,

WM. SAMUEL JOHNSON.

) Lower House:

estion put, Whether the foregoing Report be accepted; esolved in the negative.

Test, RICHARD LAW, *Clerk.*

Art. VI.—AMERICAN LITERATURE.

Cyclopædia of American Literature; embracing Personal Critical Notices of Authors, and Selections from their W tings, from the Earliest Period to the Present Day; a Portraits, Autographs, and other Illustrations. By Ev A. Duyckinck and George L. Duyckinck. In Two Volun 1855. New York: Charles Scribner.

The volumes whose title stands at the head of the present ticle we regard as among the most valuable of the issues fi the press for many years. Apart from the deep and abid interest, which necessarily attaches to the subject of our Natic Literature, it is hardly possible to over-estimate the imports to us, as Americans, of a right appreciation of the results of intellectual and moral culture and progress. Every one, do less, sees plainly the evidences of our advancement in we and consequence in the world. Every one, probably, kn that the United States of America, in a political point of vi rank among the first class powers of the world, and it may are destined to assume a position even still higher than tha any nation on the face of the earth. We all see, and are q convinced of these things; for they are before our eyes ev day, and are again and again, in ten thousand ways, ur upon our attention through the Newspaper and Period Press. But the number of those who duly weigh the histor our Literature, and its importance in making up our nati greatness and renown, is, we apprehend, even less than th who have something like an adequate idea of the nature extent of that Literature. The higher life, the intellec vigor and activity, the secret power which operates thro mind acting upon mind, the immense influence of a book- matter what its size—a right down, earnest, telling book, wh every one reads, because every one *must* read it,—these, many among us, we believe, sufficiently appreciate. An E tric Telegraph, a Railroad, a Steamship, a vast Factory, of the most wonderfully intricate yet harmoniously work machinery, every one can readily see and feel to be of g value and moment in these days of ours, and calculated to us forward in physical, social, and political importance. not quite so readily is every one able to see—what is no true, however—that the Literature of our country is, in it

fects upon the people, more powerful and far reaching than an Electric Telegraph, more wonderful in its working and its vast energy, than the grandest machinery that ever mortal wit or wisdom has produced. Marvel as we may at the gigantic strides of our country toward wealth and power in the world, we cannot but marvel still more at the Literature which has been, and is, working for evil as well as good, in her midst. No nation has ever done what the United States of America have accomplished, within the same period of time. No people on the face of the earth have ever had opportunities and advantages equal to ours. And we might almost say, no people have ever produced within less than eighty years, so many and so really great men in literature of every description. Our Poets, our Historians, our Senators, our Scientific Writers, our Philologists, our Legal Authors, our Pulpit Orators, are hardly surpassed by the mother country; and although it is true that we owe her a large debt of gratitude in this behalf, yet it may, and it ought to be, plainly understood, that as a full grown man we are already paying back of the fruits of our own labors into the bosom of our time-honored parent.

Let our readers consider, for a moment, what is it that elevates a people, and renders them capable of lofty aspirations? What is it that enables them to make advances in all that constitutes national greatness and power? It is not, surely, the invention of Machinery, the wonders of discovery in Physical Science, the increased facilities for Trade and Commerce—admitting even that these were possible where Literature does not exist. No, it is the leaven of sound, healthy, Christian Literature which leavens the whole mass; it is the power of mind, the strength and force of intellect, the burning words of genius, and patriotism, and humanity, and above all true religion, which work and ferment, in the social and political community, and keep it from the dullness and deadness of stagnation. In the same proportion that the mind is superior to the body, just in the same is Literature higher and deeper, and stronger in its effects than anything else which can be named as giving life and activity to a nation. Literature is like the vivifying spirit which permeates the whole body of the people, and its triumphs are seen in what it renders men capable of effecting in their reaching after higher and holier things than this earth can afford. A sound, vigorous Literature is the very life blood of a nation's progress. A high-toned, manly literature is a proof of a free people's use of that highest of all liberty, "the liberty wherewith CHRIST has made us free." And it may safely be averred, that no nation has ever enjoyed the privi-

leges of which we speak, without being itself free and develop ing the energies of a free people.

We might enlarge upon this subject, in its general aspects to almost any extent, and we might present our readers with learned and apposite disquisition upon the true nature, ob ject, extent, and dignity of Literature. We might dilate upo the vast influence which Literature has ever exerted on th character and fate of nations throughout the history of the world and we might point to Greece and Rome of old, as glorious be cause of their Homer, and Plato, and Thucydides, and Xeno phon, and their Livy and Tacitus, and Cicero, even more tha because of their great statesmen and soldiers, and their prowes in battle. The whole topic is a very inviting one, and w might find much to say that would be interesting and profita ble to our readers, showing that Literature is indeed, a Schlegel justly terms it, "in its reach and comprehension th epitome of all the intellectual capabilities and progressive im provement of mankind." But we forbear, and ask rather th attention of our readers to the volumes whose recent publica tion affords so sincere gratification to every American. As ou wish and endeavor is to put our readers in possession of a fai and just conception of the nature, contents, and character o these volumes, we shall take the most direct and straight-forward way of attaining that desirable end.

The design of the "Cyclopædia of American Literature," a the authors set it forth in their Preface, is to bring together a far as possible in one work convenient for perusal and reference, memorials and records of the writers of the country and thei works, from the earliest period to the present day. As in America the use of the pen has, for the most part, been in cidental to other pursuits, there are consequently numerou points, not merely relating to authorship, but extending into th spheres of Social and Political life, which are to be sought fo in literary biography, and particularly in the literary biography of America. The history of our Literature, as presented in th pages of this Cyclopædia, is not so much an exhibition of ar and invention, of Literature in its immediate and philosophica sense, as a record of mental progress and cultivation, of fact and opinions, which derives its main interest from its historica rather than its critical value. It is plainly important to know what books have been produced, and by whom; whatever th books may have been, or whoever the men. The book pro ducers of our country have mostly devoted their lives to othe callings than that of professed authorship. They have bee Divines, Physicians, Lawyers, Politicians, Editors, Militar

men, Travelers, and, incidentally, Authors. On that account it has been necessary, in telling their story, to include many details not of a literary character, in order to exhibit fairly the proportion which Literature bore in their lives. Bearing in mind, also, that we are under obligations to authors not born in America, the Messrs. Duyckinck have thought it only consistent with their main design to place upon their pages accounts of foreign scholars and writers who have visited us and lived among us, frequently enduring privation, and freely expending their talents and energies in the literary service of the country. The names of Berkeley, Witherspoon, Lieber, Schaff, and others, will at once suggest themselves to the reader as worthy of this recognition of their services in our behalf.

The arrangement of the matter of the Cyclopædia is chronological, following as nearly as practicable the date of birth of each individual. In carrying out this arrangement the authors very properly direct attention to the three general periods covered by their work, i. e., the Colonial Era, the Revolutionary Period, and the Present Century. Each of these has its marked characteristics, which are admirably summed up by the authors.

During the Colonial Era, the New England Puritan school of writers flourished, the patient, hard working, acute divines, the scholars who gave life to the early seats of learning, the first race of chroniclers, several genial observers of nature, as the Bartrams, and an occasional quaint poet, who penned verses without consulting the pleasure of Minerva. In this period there is rudeness, roughness, but much strength; frequently a high order of eloquence; great diligence and large collections of materials for history. Our oldest Colleges, as Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Columbia, and others, were established in this era. And among the great men stand out Roger Williams, Cotton, the Mathers, Jonathan Edwards; while Franklin heralded the more genial cultivation which was to follow.

The Revolutionary period is remarkable for the great legal and constitutional principles which were discussed and in a measure settled. Otis, Dickinson, Jefferson, and Adams, usher in this period, and such men as Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, in the Federalist, may justly be said to have brought it to its close. It was then that America first claimed, in tones which could not be hushed, to be heard on the great questions which lie at the foundation of a free people's life and happiness. No doubt, quite as good Puritan divinity had appeared in England as ever had been produced in Massachusetts or Connecticut; no doubt better poetry had been written than any which

our countrymen could lay claim to; but the manliness, the clear straightforwardness, the cogency, the eloquence, of many of the colonial productions on constitutional topics, compelled a hearing from all, and elicited the praise of no mean judge Lord Chatham. Polished wit, and keen satiric humor, too flourished in this period, and were brought to bear in support of the same great purpose. The intellect of our country was thoroughly awakened; and Dr. Rush, in 1799, put on record as follows: "From a strict attention to the state of mind in this country, before the year 1774, and at the present time, I am satisfied the ratio of intellect is as twenty to one, and of knowledge as one hundred to one, in these States, compared with what they were before the American Revolution."

The third period, viz, the Present Century, exhibits the results of this increasing intellectual activity and force, with a large infusion from foreign sources. New England has produced men like Channing, and Bancroft, and Emerson, and such like Webster from Massachusetts, and Calhoun from South Carolina, have illustrated and adorned Political Science; Marshall, Kent, and Story, have interpreted Law; Paulding, Cooper, Irving, and many others have largely contributed to our light as well as elegant Literature; Bryant, Halleck, and Longfellow, have given glory to our name as sweet, melodious, and profound masters of Song; Oratory has gained new triumphs in the halls of our National Legislature; and, in short, there is no department of the Belles Lettres which has not been entered upon and cultivated with success by American authors.

The Messrs. Duyckinck further illustrate their high conception of the duty imposed upon them in preparing this Cyclopædia, by a faithful effort to exhibit fairly and amply all portions of the country. There is no sectional feeling manifested by them, no attempt to set forth the North as superior or inferior to the South or West. Mental activity in our country has not been dependent on latitude or longitude; on the contrary, it appears to have been almost uniformly developed. The North has always had its great advantages; its learned institutions and the men necessarily connected with them, its great commercial centres calling forth the powers of the press; its great cities have, of course, given it the advantage in the number of authors; but apart from these important stimuli, the South and West justly claim to have done their share in promoting and adding to our national wealth of books. Acting on this conviction, the Messrs. Duyckinck have given a very fair and full consideration to the literary claims of the South and the West; and from a very commendatory notice of the

Cyclopædia in an important Southern Magazine we infer that our rather sensitive brethren in the Old Dominion and that quarter, are satisfied with their share in this important work.

In carrying out their design, the authors of the Cyclopædia have wisely judged that to the early periods preference should be given in fullness of display. The lives of the old worthies are full of curious and instructive matter, and the authors have devoted unwearied pains in endeavoring to place the main facts of their history and career fairly before the reader; it is not too much to say, that their success has been commensurate with their diligence and labor in this interesting field of research. The Revolutionary matter has similar claims to a full presentation, as well for its novelty as its characteristic display of our fathers' days, when the song and the jest helped to relieve the sterner incidents of the great struggle for freedom. Of the authors of the present day, less copious extracts are presented, from the necessity of the case, and they may reasonably be left to speak for themselves, through their works now before the public. The Messrs. Duyckinck have desired and honestly labored to deal fairly and justly by them all, and the reader must judge how far they have been successful in carrying out their design. Farther on, we shall give our opinion more fully and freely than is called for here.

As illustrating the plan of the work, as well as the genial spirit with which its articles have been prepared, we shall do ourselves and the reader the pleasure of making here and there an extract from the Cyclopædia of American Literature; and we shall greatly mistake if the conclusion be not reached, that, under all the circumstances of the case, our National Literature is something to be proud of, and to cherish as a precious boon to ourselves and our children.

Among the early benefactors to the cause of education in the Church, Dr. Blair holds no mean rank. In giving an account of William and Mary College, the Messrs. Duyckinck thus speak of him and his long and useful life:

"Dr. James Blair was a Scotchman by birth, was educated in Scotland, and took orders in the Scottish Episcopal Church. He went to England towards the close of the reign of Charles II, and was persuaded by the Bishop of London to emigrate to Virginia about the year 1685, and was probably employed as a missionary, as there is no record of his having been connected with any parish till as late as 1711, when he was made Rector of Bristow parish in Williamsburgh.

"In 1689, the Bishop of London appointed him his Commissary in the colonies of Virginia and Maryland, which office he continued to hold till his death. In virtue of this office, he had a seat in the Council of State, and received £100 per annum as Councillor. Through his exertions, a subscription of £3,500 was raised towards the endowment of a college, and he was sent to

England by the General Assembly in 1692, for the purpose of soliciting a charter. The charter was obtained, and he appointed President in the charter itself. This office he held to the day of his death, a period of fifty years. He died in March, 1743, in the eighty-eighth year of his age. He appears to have been a man of great energy and perseverance. He had to contend with great discouragements and difficulties during the whole of his course. He was opposed and thwarted in his plans for the establishing and improvement of the college by the royal governors, by the council, and even by the clergy at times; but he persevered through all discouragements. He must also have been a man of great purity of character, for in all the contests in which he was engaged, his adversaries never reproached him with any immorality. At one time a large majority of the clergy were arrayed against him. They accused him of exercising his office in a stern and haughty manner, but with nothing further. The clergy were many of them men of very questionable character—the very refuse of the Established Church in England; and these were not a little offended at the strictness of the discipline he attempted to enforce.

"Dr. Blair has left behind him three volumes of Sermons, from texts selected from the Sermon on the Mount. They are written in a lucid and simple style, and are remarkable for their good sense and practical character. Waterland edited the Third edition of these Sermons, printed in London in 1741, and wrote a preface containing a brief sketch of the author's life. He highly commends the Sermons as both sound in doctrine and felicitous in style. Such a commendation from such an author is no small praise. There is still extant another small work, which Dr. Blair took part in compiling. It is entitled *The State of his Majesty's Colony in Virginia;* by Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton: and gives an account of the soil, productions, religion, and laws of the colony, with a particular account of the condition of William and Mary College. It was printed in 1727, but it bears strong internal marks of having been drawn up about the year 1699.

"Dr. Blair was more than sixty years a clergyman, fifty-eight of which he spent in Virginia. He was Commissary fifty-four years, and President of the college fifty years. His remains were deposited in the churchyard at Jamestown, and an inscription alluding to his life and services, was engraved on his tombstone. But the stone has been broken, and the inscription is so damaged that it cannot now be deciphered. He left the whole of his library, consisting mostly of works on divinity, to the college. These books are still in the college library, and many of them contain notes in his handwriting."

That witty parson, Mather Byles, receives a full and careful notice from the authors in some four or five pages of the Cyclopædia. Our readers, we doubt not, will appreciate the good things told of the punning divine.

"Dr. Byles's reputation as a wit has overshadowed his just claims to regard as a pulpit orator. His published sermons, of which several are extant, some of them having reached a second and third edition, show him to have possessed a fine imagination, great skill in amplification, and great command of language, combined with terseness of expression. Passages in these discourses would not do discredit to the best old English divines. Several were preached on public occasions, but are, like all his other discourses, entirely free from the political allusions in which his brother clergymen so frequently indulged. On being asked why he avoided this topic, he replied, "I have thrown up four breastworks, behind which I have entrenched myself, neither of which can be forced. In the first place, I do not understand politics; in the second place, you all do, every man and mother's son of you; in the third place, you have politics all the week, pray let one day in seven be devoted to religion; in the fourth place, I am engaged in a work of infinitely greater importance: give me any subject to preach on of more consequence than the truths I bring you, and I will preach on it the next sabbath.

The *ana* which have been preserved, show that his reputation as a wit was well deserved. There was a slough opposite his house, in which, on a certain wet day, a chaise containing two of the town council stuck fast. Dr. Byles came to his door, and saluted the officials with the remark, "Gentlemen, I have often complained to you of this nuisance without any attention being paid to it, and I am very glad to see you *stirring in this matter* now."

In the year 1780, a very dark day occurred, which was long remembered as "the dark day." A lady neighbor sent her son to the Doctor to know if he could tell her the cause of the obscurity. "My dear," was the answer to the messenger, "give my compliments to your mother, and tell her that I am as much in the dark as she is."

One day a ship arrived in Boston with three hundred street lamps. The same day, the Doctor happened to receive a call from a lady whose conversational powers were not of the kind to render a long interview desirable. He availed himself of the newly arrived cargo to despatch his visitor. "Have you heard the news?" said he, with emphasis. "Oh, no! What news?" "Why three hundred new lights have come over in the ship this morning from London, and the selectmen have wisely ordered them to be put in irons immediately." The visitor forthwith decamped in search of the particulars of this invasion of religious liberty.

When brought before his judges at the time of his trial they requested him to sit down and warm himself. "Gentlemen," was the reply, "when I came among you, I expected persecution; but I could not think you would have offered me the fire so suddenly."

A *mot* of Byles's is related by the hospitable wits of Boston, to a visitor, as he passes by King's Chapel, in Tremont street. There are two courses of windows by which that building is lighted on its sides; the lower ones are nearly square. In allusion to this architectural peculiarity of the square embrasures of its solid walls, Byles said that he had often heard of ecclesiastical canons, but never saw the portholes before. Another, a revolutionary witticism, does justice to Byles's toryism. When the British troops, the lobsters, passed his door, after entering the town: "Ah," said he, "now our grievances will be red-dressed."

His system of practical joking is said to have been as felicitous as his verbal, though rather more expensive to the victims.

The Doctor, however, occasionally met his match. A lady whom he had long courted unsuccessfully, married a gentleman by the name of Quincy. "So, madam," said the unsuccessful suitor, on meeting her afterwards, "it appears you prefer a Quincy to Byles." "Yes, for if there had been anything worse than *biles*, God would have afflicted Job with them."

He was not, however, always unsuccessful with the fair sex, as he was twice married. His first wife was a niece of Governor Belcher, and her successor, the dignity apparently diminishing with the relationship, a daughter of Lieutenant Governor Tailer.

In person Dr. Byles was tall and well proportioned. His voice was powerful and melodious, and he was a graceful and impressive speaker."

Passing by much interesting matter, we come to a name that must ever command respect and even admiration at the hands of Churchmen, and Connecticut Churchmen especially. The Messrs. Duyckinck, though they furnish no extract from his writings, still give Samuel Seabury a cordial notice as one of the early names to be held in honor in American Literature. We extract the notice as it stands on their pages:

"Samuel Seabury was the son of the Rev. Samuel Seabury, missionary of th Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at New London, Conn. He was bor at Groton in 1728, and was graduated at Yale, 1748. He then went to Scot

land to study theology, but while thus employed, also devoted his attention
medicine. He was ordained, and on his return to America, settled at Ne
Brunswick, as the missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gosp
In 1756, he removed with the consent of the Society, to Jamaica, and fro
thence, in 1766, to Westchester, where he took charge, in addition to h
church, of a classical school. Here he wrote and published, anonymousl
several pamphlets in favor of the Crown, under the signature of A. W. Farm
These publications were commonly attributed to him, and were the cause of h
being seized, in 1775, by a party of soldiers, carried to New Haven, and i
prisoned. As the fact of authorship could not be proved, he was suffered
return to Westchester, where he continued to exert himself in behalf of t
same opinions. After the declaration of independence, he removed with h
family to New York, on the entry of the British, and remained until t
peace, officiating, during a portion of the time, as chaplain to the Kin
American Regiment, commanded by Col. Fanning, practising medicine for h
own and the support of those dependent upon him.

In March, 1783, immediately after the peace, Dr. Seabury, having be
elected bishop by the clergy of Connecticut, sailed for England, and applied f
consecration to the Archbishop of York, the see of Canterbury being then v
cant. This application failed, in consequence of the inability of the Engli
bishops to dispense with the oath of allegiance to the Crown, and the difficul
of procuring an act of parliament for the purpose. Having spent more than
year in England, in fruitless efforts to overcome these obstacles, Dr. Seabury,
August, 1784, made a similar application to the bishops of the Scottish Epis
pal Church, by whom he was consecrated on November 14th, 1784. In t
spring of the following year he returned to America, and entered on the duti
of his office. He resided at New London, where he also filled his fathe
place as rector of the church, in addition to his episcopal duties.

In 1790, he published an address to the ministers and congregations of t
Presbyterian and Independent persuasions in the United States of Amerie
He also published several sermons delivered on special occasions, and, in 17
Discourses on Several Subjects, in two volumes, to which a third was added
1798. These discourses displayed the vigor and earnestness of the man, qua
ties which were also exerted to good effect at the early conventions of t
church, in the arrangement of the liturgy and other important matte
Bishop Seabury died, February 25, 1796, at New London."

Two or three pages further on there is a very pleasant artic
on the good Bishop Berkeley, with choice extracts from h
works. We need not dwell upon these; his is a name th
Connecticut has linked indissolubly with the progress of the
logical education in her "Berkeley Divinity School." W
cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting the goo
Bishop's verses on the prospect of planting arts and learning i
America.

"The Muse, disgusted at an age and clime,
Barren of every glorious theme,
In distant lands now waits a better time,
Producing subjects worthy fame;

In happy climes, where from genial sun
And virgin earth such scenes ensue,
The force of art by nature seems outdone,
And fancied beauties by the true:

In happy climes the seat of innocence,
Where nature guides and virtue rules,
Where men shall not impose for truth and sense,
The pedantry of courts and schools:

There shall be sung another golden age,
The rise of empire and of arts,
The good and great inspiring epic rage,
The wisest heads and noblest hearts.

Not such as Europe breeds in her decay;
Such as she bred when fresh and young,
When heavenly flame did animate her clay,
By future poets shall be sung.

Westward the course of empire takes its way;
The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
Time's noblest offspring is the last."

And also the paragraph which narrates his exit from the stage of life:

"In his death Berkeley realized the Euthanasia which he had desired. On a Sunday evening, Jan. 14, 1753, as he was with his family in his residence at Oxford, lying on a couch listening to his wife reading a sermon by Sherlock, the final messenger came to him in silence, and it was not perceived that he was dead till his daughter offered him a cup of tea. He was buried at Christ Church, and a well written inscription in Latin was put upon his monument: but the friendly pen of Pope wrote his lasting epitaph:

'To Berkeley every virtue under heaven.'"

Another extract from the first volume is all that our limits admit, and it relates to one of our Rt. Rev. Fathers, whose zeal, courage, and activity have left their impress upon the Church in America; we mean Bishop Chase. Several pages are devoted to giving an account of the varied life of Bishop Chase, mostly drawn from his characteristic Reminiscences. After noting that Mr. Chase read prayers and preached for the first time, in Ohio, in March, 1817, and was consecrated Bishop in February, 1819, the authors go on to say:

"In 1823 the bishop formed the resolution of visiting England, to solicit funds for the establishment of a school of theology in the West. The scheme was regarded as chimerical by his brother bishops, and met with opposition from the friends of the General Theological Seminary in New York. The bishop persevered, and with the small provision of $400 to meet his expenses, sailed for Liverpool. His first experiences were disheartening, but he persevered, and found in Lord Gambier, to whom he carried a letter from Henry Clay, and Lord Kenyon, liberal and influential friends. The bishop made a donation of his farm to the proposed seminary, and agreed that no funds contributed should be drawn, until English donors were satisfied by the voucher of Henry Clay, or in case of his death the Governor of the State, that the conditions of the gift had been complied with. He returned after a few months' absence with about $20,000. The seminary was commenced by the reception of students in the bishop's own house at Worthington. He appointed his teachers and paid them from his own funds, and such as he collected from the students themselves. His wife was his secretary, his housekeeper, his adviser, and treasurer in all this. Such a commencement of a great institution of religion and learning, on so economical a plan, was never elsewhere witnessed. The next step was the purchase of eight thousand acres as a domain. The bishop

rightly estimating the importance of his own personal supervision, built cabin on the hill on which the college was to stand.

On his visit to the east to attend the meeting of the General Convention the bishop made a tour, during which he collected a large sum in aid of h project. A portion of the buildings was commenced on his return, and in goo season completed. Scarcely, however, had the institution gone into operation when a difficulty arose between the bishop and the professors, as to the limi of the power of the former as *ex-officio* president. The matter was brought int the Convention of the diocese in 1831, and a report made, virtually endorsin the professors. The bishop said nothing, and the report was unanimousl adopted. He retired from the Convention and tendered his resignation, whic was accepted. He soon after removed to Michigan with his family, where he o cupied himself with his wonted energy in missionary duty as a presbyter, unt he received, in 1835, an invitation from the small handful of clergy and lai which composed the diocese, to become the first Bishop of Illinois. He accep ed the appointment, and soon after, undaunted by the hard requital his form labors had received, began his exertions for the foundation of a Theologic Seminary and College. He sailed for England in October, to appeal again his old friends for aid, and the appeal was liberally responded to. Furth donations in the Eastern States enabled him to buy land, and commence buil ing. The corner-stone of the new institution, Jubilee College, was laid on th fourth of April, 1839, on a large and beautiful tract of land, secured by th bishop's wise forethought, as a domain and future source of revenue. He nex passed a year in traveling through the States, north and south, soliciting fun to establish scholarships, and was tolerably successful in his efforts. H Reminiscences were written and published with a view to advance the san cause. Jubilee College was built and opened, and the good and venerable pr late, by virtue of seniority the presiding bishop of his church, was enabled t enjoy for some years the spectacle of its harmony and usefulness. His cotta home, Robin's Nest, was not far off, and it was here that on the twentieth da of September, 1852, he closed his long life of labor and usefulness, a career u equaled in its results by that of any clergyman in the United States.

Bishop Chase's Reminiscences fill two large octavo volumes, a large porti of which, however, is occupied by letters addressed to him, and documents co nected with the Ohio controversy, and other events of his life. The wo abounds in passages of great beauty, the character of which may be judg from the extracts interspersed in our narrative. They remind us of the hea felt simplicity of Izaak Walton. The same noble trait was a characteristic the discourses and conversation of the man. But while harmless as the dov he was also wise as the serpent. His conduct in relation to the endowme of his colleges shows that he was a shrewd and able man, "not slothful in bu ness." With his personal humility, he properly combined a high sense of th dignity of his office.

Bishop Chase's countenance expressed singular determination, combin with benevolence. He was tall and well proportioned; and arrayed in th flowing vestments of his office, with the dark velvet cap, which he wore co tinually after a severe illness brought on by exposure, and which he describ with his wonted quaintness, as "a thick covering to his head, in the shape a night cap," his form seemed to fill up as amply to the eye as his career a words to the mind, the full ideal of a Bishop."

The second of these portly volumes brings us down to th authors of the present day, with a few exceptions; we ha marked a number of pages for choice extracts, that our reade might see how the Bishops and Clergy of the Church, as w as her distinguished laymen, appear on the pages of the Cycl pædia. We intended to quote what the authors have said the lamented Wainwright, the learned Drs. Jarvis and Turne

the eloquent Dr. Hawks, the beloved Croswell, and many others among the clergy, and also of Binney, Verplanck, Reed, Mr. Sigourney, and the like, among our Church laity. We intended, too, to give the reader some choice specimens of the products of our Literature not directly in connection with the Church; but we find that we must forego the pleasure of further quotations from these volumes, and devote what remaining space is left to us to some more general remarks, in compliance with our promise on a previous page.

There can be no doubt whatever that the authors of the Cyclopædia of American Literature are entitled to very great praise. They undertook a work of vast difficulty; a work requiring many years of research and study; a work which no man would covet who knows what it is to deal with that *genus irritabile*, the writers and makers of books. They entered upon this work with zeal and energy, with the most liberal views and purposes, and with a feeling of devoted love for their country and her just claims to honor in the field of Literature and Science. And now that their work is before the public, let the public judge if it be not a great work which they have accomplished; not a *perfect* work, not a work which will not require much careful revision, some changes, some excisions, and many additions; but a truly great work, for which they deserve the respect and esteem of all lovers of their native land.

Our business is not that of laudation; we deal not in indiscriminate praise; we are quite conscious that the Cyclopædia is not altogether what we should have liked, and that, both in omission and commission, it is open to criticism. We could point out a number of names which have been omitted, names whose claim to recognition in a work of this kind, cannot be questioned. We could also put our finger upon quite a number of names which, in our opinion, are little entitled to notice in any way, and certainly are not worthy of occupying the space which the amiable authors have allowed them.

In this connection, we may, perhaps, also be permitted to say, that in the wide sweeping of their drag-net, which has embraced almost everything in the shape of Literature, which has ever been issued from the American press, the authors have found no place for even a recognition of the *Church Review;* a quarterly of already more than eight years standing, and which has given to the world some of the best literary efforts of several of the best *belles-lettres* scholars in the country—efforts which have commanded marked attention in the first literary circles abroad. We see, however, that they have not forgotten the "*Literary World*," a weekly paper,

which finally died on their own hands. We do not complain of this omission, as we certainly need not have felt greatly flattered in seeing the Review included in such a motley list of the literary organs, agencies, and instrumentalities of the country. And yet we can hardly be expected to overlook this illustration of the authors' taste and judgment, or knowledge.

We could also enumerate a few mistakes which we have discovered in our present examination of the volumes, and we presume that, without doubt, there are others in other parts of this extensive work. But when we have said this much, we have said enough—perhaps more than enough—in the way of criticism, which may appear unfavorable to the Cyclopædia. We entertain no unfriendly feeling, however; our readers will have noticed, in what has been said in the previous portions of this Article, that we have a very high respect for the authors of the Cyclopædia, and we are prepared to rejoice that the preparation of it fell into their hands, rather than into those of some one else. And we will say frankly, why we are especially glad that *they* entered upon this work. It is simply this: because they are Churchmen, and feel as Churchmen, in the work imposed upon them.

Let not the reader suppose that this is a point of little moment. They who know what scant justice the Church ordinarily receives at the hands of American popular book makers, no matter what the subject of the books may be, will appreciate the favor which these volumes have enjoyed in being prepared by Churchmen. They who have witnessed how little willingness there has been to admit the claims of Churchmen to any status in literature of any kind, will agree with us, that it is a matter of rejoicing indeed, that a Cyclopædia of American Literature, should issue from those who as loyal sons, desired that the Church should receive at their hands fair and just presentation of what she has done, in setting forward and adorning our national literature. Of course, we do not, for a moment, mean to imply that any injustice has been committed against those not in or of the Church; not at all. The large liberality of the authors has led them to expatiate freely and fully upon the merits of many a writer, whom, as a Churchman, we should feel bound to censure and condemn. They have striven to do justice to all; and we honestly think, that they have approached very near to that exact and impartial justice which all may claim in the field of literature, though half of these are enemies to the Church, and teachers of heresy and schism in its worst shapes. But, apart from this, we do rejoice that Churchmen have their claims respected and appre-

ciated in a national work like the present; we do rejoice that they can be spoken of without flings and sneers, and in terms which show that the writer is not ignorant of the ordinary language and sentiments of Churchmen, and is able to speak of Church matters without perpetual and offensive, as well as ridiculous blundering.

And now, in bringing our review to a close, we beg leave to advert to the opening pages of the present Article, and to urge again upon our readers the importance of a thorough knowledge and appreciation of our National Literature. We shall not repeat our words; we shall not weary the reader by dilating upon this fruitful topic; we shall only ask him to deal fairly by himself and his native land, in this matter. And further, we shall ask him to look into the question of how far the Church and Churchmen have been concerned in bringing about the result to which our Literature, as a free people, has already attained. Let him enter upon this pleasant work at his early leisure; let him trace the footprints of the men who, laboring for Christ and the Church, labored also for the cause of sound learning, and a healthy, vigorous Literature. Let him note the books which they have produced, the character of their contents, the influence which they exerted, and are still exerting among our countrymen. Let him place fairly before himself the men of past days, no less than those now on the great stage of life, and then let him judge whether the Church has not a good and lawful claim to be in the front rank of those who are ministering to the intellectual and moral culture of Americans. He will find it a most pleasant, as well as most useful occupation. And, we doubt not, that it will stimulate him to do what he can, likewise, to make the Church more and more honored by her doing more and more for the cause of godly learning, and the purer and higher branches of polite literature.

But we have said enough. The Messrs. Duyckinck have added lustre to their already well-earned fame, in the walks of literature; and they are richly entitled to the thanks and praise which are accorded them in all directions. They have done more than increase their own reputation. They have proved that American Literature is a real, genuine, vigorous Literature, of which, too, no lover of his country need be ashamed, and which, if fostered, as it deserves, will demonstrate, that Americans are as capable of great and noble deeds in intellectual pursuits, as they have shown themselves to be in Physical Science and political advancement. God grant that with all this, it may never be forgotten, that it is RIGHTEOUSNESS which exalteth a nation, and that it is SIN which is a reproach, and a lasting disgrace to any people!

Art. VII.—WESTERN CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY.

As a movement has already been commenced which promises important results for the Church, and as it is one in behalf of which a deep interest is desired on the part of Churchmen, we give in the following pages, a brief sketch of its origin, progress, methods and designs.

It will have been noticed by the readers of our Church papers, that an Association was formed some time ago, called the "Church Land Association for the West." It originated with a party of gentlemen, clerical and lay, during an excursion on the Upper Mississippi, in the summer of 1854. "At a conference held on board the Steamer, it was determined that the Church needs, and must have, lots and lands in and about all the growing towns of our great Western World for the erection at a suitable time hereafter, of Churches and Parsonages. Locations must be secured now, whilst the price of land is comparatively low, and held by Trustees, until the organization of parishes, and then deeded over to the respective Vestries." It was also determined that the operations of the Association should extend to Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas and Nebraska. It was further determined that the sum of 10,000 dollars be raised immediately, (and if possible in sums of $500 each, from twenty persons,) for the purpose of purchasing lands and town lots under the direction of the Trustees."

We have here the brief history of the incipient steps in the formation of the Association. It appears that little was really done to give effect to the plan, until the following Spring, when, in May a meeting was held in the city of Milwaukee, Wis., at which time a Constitution was formed, Officers chosen, and a General Agent appointed. Several circumstances prevented his entering on the work until the month of October following. The Agent then visited the cities of Chicago and St. Louis, presenting the whole subject to the Episcopal congregations of those cities, and receiving much encouragement to push forward the enterprise.

After visiting Milwaukee, preparatory to a more extended application to the Churchmen of that city, he set out for the East. Stopping a few days in the city of Buffalo, W. N. Y., and making known the objects of the Association to the large and flourishing congregations of Trinity, St. Paul's, and St. John's parishes, making small gatherings by the way, he con-

tinued his journey, calling on the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Western New York, and receiving from him a word of approbation, with a "God-speed." He next presented the subject in a brief address to the congregation of St. Paul's Church, Syracuse, W. N. Y. Encouragement was there given that liberal contributions might be expected from that generous people. Pursuing his journey he was kindly received by his Rev. Brethren in the city of UTICA, and had an interview with the Ex-Governor, who has large interests in the West, and can well understand the importance of this movement. Visiting the cities of NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA, it was deemed advisable to hold public Meetings in those Cities, for the purpose of getting the whole matter prominently before the Church. The very unfavorable state of the weather for many successive Sundays, proved a most unfortunate barrier in the way of securing any full attendance at these Meetings. They were held, however, and a favorable response given. The one in New York was taken hold of in earnest by several of the leading Clergy, and liberal subscriptions were made on the occasion.

It was deemed important that certain changes should be made in the Constitution of the Association, and recommendations of proposed changes were forwarded to Western Brethren. These were favorably received, and the Annual Meeting was at once called, to be held in St. James' Church, Chicago, on Wednesday evening, the 20th February. Notices were sent to the members, and a full Meeting convened to take into consideration the proposed enlargement of the plans, and other alterations. Three Bishops of the Church were present on this occasion, viz, Bishops KEMPER, LEE of Iowa, and CLARK of Rhode Island.

At this Meeting the whole subject was reviewed, and such changes adopted as were deemed essential to its future success. The proposition to enlarge the sphere of its operations, making it embrace the whole Domestic Missionary field, was considered and declared impracticable. The Society did not feel at liberty to legislate for the whole Church on this subject. The Members were willing, however, if it shall be thought best, to form a General Society, (as the Triennial Meeting of the General Convention will be held this year,) to merge this Association into a general one. But until such action shall be had it was concluded to adhere to the *original limits* or Territory for whose especial benefit the Association was at first formed. The *name* was changed by a unanimous vote—calling it hereafter the "WESTERN CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY."

The next important change adopted, was increasing the Board of Managers, (dropping the title of Trustees,) making

them to consist of *sixteen laymen* of the Church, one ha these to reside in the West—*five* members of this Boa constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Lay C mittees of three members each, were appointed in each Di within the field to act in conjunction with the Ecclesia Authorities of the respective Dioceses, as a Committee o vestments. These Committees to confine their purchas Church Sites or building lots, parsonages and glebes.

The suggestion of Eastern Brethren to make it as much *lay* measure as possible was well received and approved. Church, we have too long ignored the laity—not theoreti of course, because the lay element runs largely through al Ecclesiastical polity; but practically our work has been le much in the hands of the Clerical Order. We shall not be to push forward Church extension as we ought, until th greatly changed. We have never known a Clergyman o Church, who was tenacious of his Order, (of his *cloth* so to sp who did not greatly weaken his influence with the laity. much as this Society is entirely of a business character, an to do with the temporal welfare of the Church, it seems hi proper that the laity should have the chief direction of its af and especially in the purchase of lots for the future found of parishes. We want their experience and practical wis and should be glad to avail ourselves of it in every po way.

The duties of these Committees are defined in the Con tion. It is to be hoped they will cheerfully act for the Ch in this enterprise, and interest themselves in the manage of the Society. If successful, and there is no reason wh should not be, great indeed must be the gain to the Churc

It may well be questioned whether the duty of the Ch in this country is discharged by the slow and hesitating ma in which our Western Missions have been and still are ecuted. To those who are at all conversant with the r character of the newer settlements of our country, and the necessity of giving direction to the religious mind, it w seem a needless task to urge on them the adoption of mea which look to the spiritual improvement of Society, by early establishment of Churches. Those Christian men have paused long enough in their onward course, in this age, to reflect on this subject, have often had their minds with the most painful reflections. The Church needs to as one out of sleep, and gird herself for the coming co Infidelity and false doctrine are rife in the land, and the which othodox Christianity has on the mass of the peo believed to be weakening every year. *We have not tim*

the rapidly filling up of our Western country, to wait for the usual progress of events. We must lead the way and prepare the soil to receive the good seed of the Gospel, or no fruit will come of all our labor. A distinguished layman—a warm friend of this enterprise—said in a letter to the writer, "the difficulty with us has been, that our's, as a general rule, has not been a pioneer Church." Here is the *real* cause of our slow progress. Other causes may have retarded our work; but to be on hand in time is especially necessary in the accomplishment of this great undertaking. Surely then, when a measure so wise, so practical, in every view so likely to work out a great good, presents itself, it were most unwise not to seize at once the strong points, and occupy the ground.

It was our privilege recently to address the congregation of CHRIST CHURCH, Hartford, Conn., on this subject, of which parish the late Venerable Bishop Chase was first Rector. Nor, as we gazed upon his striking portrait which adorns the vestry-room of that Church, could we suppress the thought, how would his eye have kindled and his heart have rejoiced at this effort for the extension of the Church in the West! For of all men who have ever lived, none has done so much as he to plant the Church in its strength and beauty throughout all that vast and wide-spreading region. He had an eye to see, a heart to feel, a head to devise, a willingness to do and to suffer, a steadiness of purpose and an iron will to execute, which made him emphatically, the PIONEER BISHOP OF THE CHURCH.

A CLERGYMAN of Pennsylvania, who traveled West during the last summer, said in a communication to one of our Church Papers, on his return: "The vast extent of our Western Missionary field can never be appreciated except by seeing it. No mere examination of a Map will convey any true idea. A great deal is said about the Mississippi Valley—its future, and the importance of earnest efforts to 'preach the gospel' in those 'regions beyond.' But a glimpse even at this field, (and such only I had, and that of one part only,) wakens up the soul to thoughts and prayers for the GREAT WEST, which cannot be drawn out by any other method."

When men go and see for themselves they usually become wiser—better informed, and more likely to form a correct estimate of their duties and responsibilities. The numerical strength of this great nation must soon be in this Western Valley. The Geographical centre of our Union is much nearer the Mississippi than the Hudson. The largest proportion of the population must draw towards that centre. The fertility of its rich alluvial soil—its capability to sustain a vast population—its inland seas and mighty rivers, all combine to give the whole

region a prominence in the future history of our country, which is at once grand and imposing. Truly there is "much land to be possessed," to be possessed and cultivated by the Church of Christ, or given up to the wildest skepticism, and the rankest superstition. With what energy and determined perseverance do the men of the East push forward Railroad connections with the West? If the same earnest zeal—the same out-lay of money—the same unceasing toil—the same determined spirit actuated the Church of Christ, what glorious results would follow! Our wealthy laymen owe it to themselves, as faithful stewards of God's rich bounties; to their posterity, thousands of whom will occupy homes in this fair region; to the cause of truth and righteousness, that they fail not in efforts to plant the Standard of the Cross, and the institutions of the Church through all our extended borders.

In a mere worldly view, and as a purely business operation this effort at Church Extension should call forth their sympathies and hearty support. *It will pay.* There is no doubt of it. The investment will produce good dividends. The stock will not be subject to so many variations as other stocks. It must always be above par. The Clergy may do much to aid this effort, but they have not the means to give. It is theirs to preach the Gospel; it belongs to the Laity to uphold their hands—to see that they are sustained. Let the means be furnished for securing Church building lots, Parsonages and small Glebes, and their hands will be strengthened—a home will be provided for their families, so that they may give themselves entirely to the work of their calling, and seek with earnestness for members of Christ's flock "scattered abroad."

A small amount, judiciously invested, will greatly promote the early organization of parishes, and enable many of them to build without the frequent applications for aid, which have become so painfully prevalent. The whole effort commends itself to the good sense and the practical wisdom of the Laity. Let them respond to the application which will be made on them by the General Agent, in some *just proportion* to the outlay which they would make if they were called upon to subscribe for Railroad Stock, or other secular object, and success will crown their hopes. It will more than realize the expectations of its friends, and disappoint those who have "no good will to Zion."

In primitive times we read that those who had "houses and lands, sold them and brought the price and laid it at the Apostles' feet." This was for the *Extension of the Church.* Let those who have houses and lands more than they need, either follow the practice of the early disciples, or deed them at once

to this "CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY." In a few years they may prove of incalculable value in the future operations of our Missionary work. When Providence has given so much land to the Christians of this age and of our own country, it is "meet and right, and their bounden duty," to set apart a portion at least, to the Lord. What that should be, must be left to their own sense of right, of justice, and of the claims of the Gospel. It should not be the stinted portion of the miser's hand—the small share which the grasp of avarice doles out with unwilling heart; but the free and generous gifts of large-hearted liberality —the offerings of the "Christian tenth" at least, into the Treasury of the Lord.

Still another reason exists for this measure, in the peculiarity of the field. The population of Western towns is peculiarly a floating population. The wise investment of a small amount in the purchase of a lot for a Church and Parsonage, will soon draw around it, as a centre, settlers from abroad who are seeking for homes in the West. They begin now to inquire, before moving, after locations where there is reasonable prospect of the EPISCOPAL CHURCH being established. They write letters to Ministers and Missionaries, in order that they may obtain the information desired before setting out. Where settlements are likely to advance rapidly, there the Church should be beforehand. Thus there will be an almost certain concentration of Church families and Church influence. Missionary Stations will sooner, formed in this way, become self-supporting. One such parish well organized, will become the centre of a widespread influence for others. It will form a radius from which will go out the light of truth on the less favored regions around.

Investments, properly made, will give to the Church the advance in price, which now has to be paid to individuals and speculators. It will thus be a saving by securing lots at low prices, for which high prices must soon be demanded. *One hundred dollars* contributed to this object now will accomplish as much for the Church as five hundred five years hence. Numerous instances might be named, where five and six hundred dollars have been given for a single lot, which a few years before could have been had for fifty or sixty. There is no time to be lost. It is a most feasible, practical measure, and should at once secure the hearty coöperation of the whole Church. Individuals and parishes may for a small out-lay, establish a parish in the West, which will shortly become self-supporting, and in its turn send out its branches into the neighboring towns and the remoter settlements. Thus a bright succession of parishes will be formed, descending down to distant generations. What an idea is this! and who would not like to be the happy

instrument of beginning this line? To aid in this effort is to provide the means of carrying the Word of Life to thousands yet unborn—it is to aid in furnishing the means of Grace to those who are in danger of perishing—those who are "bone of our bone—flesh of our flesh." Scarcely one family can be addressed—certainly not one congregation in all our Eastern cities and towns—which has not its representative in the West.

This enterprise—for such it is—must underlay our future Missionary operations in the Western Valley. Though the field of its operations is now limited to a few of our Western Dioceses, it may become general in its work. If it should be thought best when the General Convention assembles, to recommend such a change, in order to make it a general auxiliary to the Domestic Missionary work of the Church, it would doubtless be adopted. The members of the Association recently convened in Chicago, did not feel authorized to form a general Society. True, it was recommended by Brethren in New York and elsewhere, whose opinions were entitled to much deference, but others feared the enlargment of the field would defeat the success of the whole plan. Should there be a good beginning made to give effect to the Society the present season, it may well be considered in its more general aspects.

We have now said all that may be requisite to give an intelligent view of the "*Western Church Extension Society.*" It deserves the prayerful consideration of the whole Church, and especially of its wealthy members. Let them resolve to aid—to give it a fair trial—give it their confidence, their encouragement and support. The names of its Officers are a sufficient guarantee that whatever is contributed will be faithfully applied to the important objects contemplated.

President—Rt. Rev. JACKSON KEMPER, D. D.

Vice President—Rt. Rev. HENRY W. LEE, D. D.

Treasurer—ROBERT B. MINTURN, Esq., of New York.

Corresponding Secretaries—For the West, Rev. W. A. SMALLWOOD, D. D., Chicago. For the East, Rev. A. N. LITTLEJOHN, New Haven.

Recording Secretary, and Conservator of Documents—Rev. R. H. CLARKSON, Chicago, Ill.

General Agent—Rev. CHARLES B. STOUT, Waukesha, Wis.

Board of Managers,

Gen. JOHN A. DIX, Prof. HORACE WEBSTER, LL. D. } N. Y.
HERMAN COPE, Esq., JAMES M. AERTSEN, Esq., } Penn.
ALEXANDER DUNCAN, Esq., R. I.
JOSEPH E. SHEFFIELD, Esq., Conn.
Hon. EDWARD A. NEWTON, Mass.
HORACE WHITE, Esq., W. N. Y.

JOHN H. KENZIE, Esq., J. L. REYNOLDS, Esq., EDWIN H. SHELDON, Esq., } Ill.
Hon. PHILO WHITE, DANIEL JONES, Esq., } Wis.
E. COOK, Esq., Gen. BOOTH, } Iowa.
Capt. J. H. SIMPSON, Minn.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

SKETCHES OF THE COLONIAL CLERGY OF MARYLAND.

BY REV. ETHAN ALLEN.

No. II.—*The Rev. William Brogden, Rector of All-Hallow's Parish, Ann Arundel County*, 1736; *and from* 1751, *of Queen Anne Parish, Prince George's County, Md.*

The present prevalent impression respecting the early Clergy of the Church of England in Maryland, that they were unfaithful shepherds, and of scandalous morals, is simply not true. That there were *some* such indeed, is not questioned, but they did not constitute even a large portion. So far from this, that Edmund Burke, in his "European Settlements in America," London, 1757, p. 226, vol. 2, thus testifies: "The people of Maryland have the same established religion with those of Virginia; but here [in Maryland] the Clergy are provided for in a much more liberal manner, and *they are the most decent and the best of the Clergy in America.*" The bad among them are but too well remembered, but the good are forgotten and unknown. But why should this be permitted when so much is due them for having planted the very Churches which yet exist here, and built the temples, in many an instance, in which the present generation worship. Has the Church done its duty to their memories? Feeling that she has not, we present our readers with another Maryland Clergyman, whose name and services richly deserve to be rescued from oblivion.

Mr. William Brogden was born and educated in England; but when and where has not been ascertained. The first authentic notice which we have of him, is found in his letters of Deacon's Orders, which were placed in the hands of the writer by his grandson, Dr. William Brogden. This document shows us that he was ordained by the Right Rev. Edmund Gibson, Lord Bishop of London, on Wednesday, the 6th of August, A. D. 1735, in the Chapel Royal at Whitehall, Westminster, in the County of Middlesex.

How soon after his admission to Holy Orders, Mr. Brogden came over to Maryland, we have not learned; but very early thereafter we find him the incumbent of All Hallow's Parish, in Ann Arundel County.

He was the successor in this Parish to the Rev. Joseph Colbatch. Mr. Colbatch having been ordained by the Right Rev. Henry Compton, Lord Bishop of London, July 4, 1694, came over to the Colony, and immediately took charge of this Parish, and continued in it till his death, which took place in January, 1734, having been Rector of it near forty years. Mr. Compton was a Clergyman of great excellence of character. A few years before his death, as we learn from Dr. Hawks, the Bishop of London wrote to him, inviting him to England, that he

might there be consecrated to the Episcopate, and then return to Mar land, as his Lordship's suffragan in the province. He was not, ho ever, permitted to leave. Such was the opposition then to a reside Bishop in the Colony, that the Government issued a writ of *ne exe* and his departure was thus prohibited. And this, be it remembere was done by a Protestant Government of the Established Church England in the province!

After having become the Rector of All-Hallow's, Mr. Brogden w married to Mrs. Haddock, of Prince George County, but she did n live long, and he then married, December 14, 1741, Miss Elizab Chapman. In the following year he purchased a beautiful farm twelve hundred acres, some twelve miles southwest from Annapolis, t seat of Government. That farm is still in possession of his grandso And the house which he built on it, and in which he lived while Rec of the Parish, is still standing. It was of wood, and forms an appe age to the residence of Dr. Brogden. We are glad that it remai having so long escaped the decays of age, and the ruthless spirit whi effaces old things for the sake of the new. We love to see the dwellin where the laborers in the Lord's vineyard lived in times long past; love to go into their library where they sat and studied, and wrote th messages of love, and where they were wont to bend their knees prayer. It is a hallowed spot.

There, near by that study, is the famous old oak still, which B Brogden, soon after he had settled here, sent to England for, and whi is said to have been raised from an acorn from the tree at Boscobel, which King ——— was hidden after his defeat, and truly it is wort of its high descent. There too is still seen a likeness of Mr. Brogd hanging on the wall. It is an interesting memorial, and quite char teristic. He is taken in a dressing gown, with books and mathemati instruments around him; and there are remaining yet two manuscr volumes in his own handwriting. One of these we have now before u it is the relic of a volume of about two quires of letter paper, fold 8vo., written evidently in his younger years, in his beautiful and compa manner. It shows something of the subject which then interested hi and engaged his time and labor. The first part of it is "*Epistu Clericanæ contra Dodwell, defensiones* 1, 2, 3 *and* 4, *excerpta*," occu ing nearly one half of the volume. Then "Some reflections on t part of a book called Amyntor, or the defense of Milton's life, whi relates to the primitive Fathers and the Canon of the New Testame by Mr. T." This, indeed, is not of great length. The rest of the v ume contains "*Robinsonii Thesis Medicina et Merborum-Abbreviat* Though much decayed, it serves well to show his studies and his patie industry. It is in truth a beautiful exemplification of the motto on t old parchment coat of arms which he brought over with him, "*Ial ipse voluptas.*"

The other is an interesting relic of Mr. Brogden's, written doubtl while Rector of this Parish. It is remarkable not only as an admiral specimen of penmanship, and of his patient industry, but more especia

as exhibiting the character of his piety. It is a blank book in the small octavo form, bound in calf, into which he copied the prayers of the Book of Common Prayer, and others, with selections from the Psalms in meter, after the manner of those now in use in our American Common Prayer Book, with the music set to them, and also a number of hymns. This book was undoubtedly prepared for his use when visiting about his large Parish. It was kept very neatly by him, though it bears marks of having been much used in turning over the pages. As showing more particularly the character and tone of his piety, as well as his love for our venerable and admirable Book of Prayer, a statement of its contents may not be unacceptable.

First, then, it has the Prayers of the Morning and Evening Service, including the Litany without the Responses, occupying two and a half pages only, there being more on a page than is usually found on one of the same size in a printed book.

Secondly, the Collects for the year, with some from the Communion and Commination Offices, each headed with an appropriate title, arranged in the order of their subjects, thus: "For Audience, 10 *p. Trin.*, 23 *p. Trin.* For Holy Spirit, *Commun. Off.* For Assistance in Prayer, *Commun. Off.* For Conversion, *Commination, and* 1, *p. Easter*," &c.

Thirdly, the Petitions *gathered* from the Collects of the Book of Common Prayer, and arranged in a continuous Prayer, first, for Grace and Assistance; secondly, for the Comforts and Graces of the Holy Spirit; thirdly, for Mortification, Pardon, and Defense; fourthly, for the Universal Church. The first is as follows, and only about one fourth the length of the others:

FOR GRACE AND ASSISTANCE.

(25. Trin.) Stir up ye wills of thy faithful people, O Lord; yt we plenteously bringing forth ye fruit of good works, may of Thee be plenteously rewarded. (Sexages.) Thou seest yt we put not our trust in any thing we do; mercifully defend us by thy power against all adversity. (17. Trin.) Let thy Grace alway prevent and follow us, and make us continually given to all good works. (East.) And as by thy special grace preventing us, thou dost put into our hearts good desires, so by thy continual help make us to bring the same to good effect. (1. Lent.) Let ye Right hand of thy majesty be stretched out to be our defense against all sorts of enemies. (5. Lent.) And of thy merciful goodness let us be governed and preserved evermore, both in body and soul, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

This is line for line, and as near the manner as we could give it, as it stands in Mr. Brogden's own handwriting.

Thirdly, Family Prayers. Thus, Morning 1, *Bible;* Evening 1, *same;* for Morning 2, *same;* for Evening 2, *same;* meaning, we suppose, those printed in many of the Bibles of that day; Morning 3, *Dr. Horneck;* Evening 3, *same;* Morning 4, *Mr. Burkett;* Evening 4, *same;* Morning 5, *Mr. Baxter;* (from his Poor Man's Family Book, abridged;) for Evening 5, *same;* Morning 6, *same;* Evening 6, *same;* for Morning 7, *Burkett;* for Evening 7, *same;* for Morning 8, *Bp. Taylor;* Evening 8, *same.* These occupy fifteen pages. One page has been counted by some one, and put down in pencil marks as containing 1055 words.

Fourthly, the visitation of the sick in part.

Fifthly, Collects for Protestant Churches at home and abroad, for the king, prince, and royal family, for Ministers of God's true Church, for the Universities of Britain and Ireland, for all who belong to the true Church, and the Congregation present, for the defenders of their country's dangers, and for ourselves and families. These are in the handwriting of a later day in his life.

Sixthly, Collects before Sermon, from Bp. Taylor and the Prayer Book—for it was the good old custom in Maryland for the Minister, after going into the pulpit, to offer up a short prayer before his Sermon, the congregation all standing, and continued to be the custom till within the last thirty years. These Collects are followed by Collects for the king and people, in time of war and dangers. Then one for after Sermon.

The latter part of the volume is filled with a selection of the meter Psalms, with music to them, and the Te Deum, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed versified and set to music, together with a collection of hymns.

The selections from the Psalms amount to eighty, and the tunes about forty. The selections seldom contain more than six stanzas, often less. The first stanza is always written with the music, after the manner of printed singing books, and then follow the other stanzas. Of the music we need not give a specimen, but of the Psalms we may, for which purpose we select the following:

PSALM III.

But thou, O Lord, art my defense,
  On thee my hopes rely;
Thou art my glory, and shall yet
  Lift up my head on high.

Since whensoe'er in like distress
  To God I made my prayer;
He heard me from his holy hill,
  Why should I now despair?

Guarded by him, I laid me down,
  My sweet repose to take;
For I through him securely sleep,
  Through him in safety wake.

Arise, and save me, O my God,
  Who oft hast own'd my cause,
And scattered oft these foes from me,
  And to thy righteous laws.

Salvation to the Lord belongs,
  He only can defend;
His blessing he extends to all,
  That on his pow'r depend.

Among the tunes are found Dundee, Old Hundred, London, Windsor, and some others now in use. The other tunes, though not of a high order of music, are yet interesting, as showing the music sung in the

ıe Churches of Maryland a hundred years ago. As there may be ıany who have not seen them, we copy the Te Deum, the Creed, the ord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and after the manner in hich they are arranged in Mr. Brogden's little volume.

BY D. BEVERIDGE.

O God, we praise thee and confess
  Thou only art the Lord,
And everlasting Father art
  By all ye earth ador'd.
To thee all angels cry aloud,
  To thee ye pow'rs on high,
Both Cherubim and Seraphim,
  Continu'ly do cry.

O Holy, Holy, Holy Lord,
  Whom heav'nly worlds obey,
The world is with the glory fill'd
  Of thy majestic ray.
Th' Apostles' glorious company,
  And prophets crowned with light,
With all the martyrs' noble host,
  Thy constant praise recite.

The holy Church throu'out the world,
  O Lord, confesses thee;
That thou eternal Father art,
  Of boundless majesty.
Thine honored, true, and only Son;
  And Holy Ghost, the Spring
Of never-ceasing joy: O Christ
  Of Glory, thou art King.

The Father's everlasting Son,
  That from on high didst come,
To save mankind, and didst not then
  Disdain the Virgin's womb.
And having overcome the sting
  Of death, thou opend'st wide
The gates of Heaven to all, who firm
  In thy belief abide.

Crown'd with thy Father's glory, thou
  At God's right hand dost sit;
Whence thou shalt come to be our judge,
  To sentence or acquit.
O therefore save thy servants, Lord,
  Whose souls so dearly cost:
Nor let the purchase of thy blood,
  Thy precious blood, be lost.

We magnify thee day by day,
  And ever worship thee;
Vouchsafe to keep us, Lord, this day,
  From sin and danger free.
Have mercy, mercy on us, Lord,
  To us thy grace extend,
According as for mercy we
  On thee alone depend.

In Thee I have reposed my trust,
And ever shall do so;
Preserve me from confusion here,
And from eternal wo.
To Father, Son and Holy Ghost, &c.

THE CREED. *Idem.*

I steadfastly believe in God
The Father of all might,
Who made the lower world, and all
The glorious world of light.
And I believe in Jesus Christ,
The everlasting Word,
The Almighty Father's only Son,
And our most gracious Lord.

Conceiv'd by th' Holy Ghost, and of
The Virgin Mary born;
By Pontius Pilate doom'd to bear
Most bitter pains and scorn.
Was crucified, and for a time
Both dead and buried lay:
Descended into hell and rose
To life on the third day.

Ascended up to Heav'n, and there
On God's right hand is plac'd;
From whence he shall return to judge
The quick and dead at last.
I likewise firmly do believe,
O Holy Ghost, in thee;
The holy universal Church;
And Saints' community.

Forgiveness of repented sins,
Through Christ our sacrifice;
The resurrection of the dead,
And life that never dies.

THE LORD'S PRAYER. *Idem.*

Our Father which in Heaven art,
Thy name be hallowed in each heart;
Thy kingdom come, may we fulfill,
Who dwell on earth, thy heavenly will,
With equal cheerfulness and love,
As saints and angels do above.
Give us this day our daily bread;
Us into no temptation lead;
But with thy grace preserve us still,
From sin, and ev'ry thing that's ill;
For thine the kingdom and the pow'r,
And glory's thine, forevermore.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS. *Idem.*

God speaks these words, O Israel hear
What I shall now command,
Thy Lord and only God am I,
Who with Almighty hand

From Egypt's land, and from ye house
Of bondage set thee free;
And, therefore, Isra'l, thou shalt have
No other Gods but me.

Thou shalt no graven image make,
Nor likeness shalt thou feign
Of anything that heav'n or earth
Or watery deep contain:
Thou shalt not bow thyself to them,
Nor outward worship pay;
Much less shalt thou in heart adore,
And to an idol pray.

For I, thy God, a jealous God,
The father's sins chastise
To third or fourth descent, of all
Who are mine enemies.
But mercy do to thousands show,
And bounteously repay
All those who me sincerely love,
And my commands obey.

The sacred name of God, thy Lord,
Thou never shalt profane,
For God will not you guiltless hold,
Who takes his name in vain.
Remember, thou, the Sabbath day,
To keep with holy care:
Six days for labor thou shalt take
To finish each affair.

Honor thy parents, that thou may'st
Both long and happy live
In that blest land which God, thy Lord,
Did for thy dwelling give.
From murder and adultery,
And theft thou shalt forbear;
Nor falsely shalt, in any case,
Against thy neighbor swear.

Thou shalt not covet house or wife,
Or man or maid of his,
Or ox, or ass, or aught whereof
He rightful owner is.
Have mercy on us, therefore, Lord,
And all our hearts incline
With diligence and care to keep
These righteous laws of thine.

Among the hymns, which are twenty-five, are those which we have in our Book of Common Prayer, now beginning with the following lines, "While shepherds kept their flocks by night," for Christmas; "Thou God all glory, honor, power," for Good Friday; "Since Christ, our Passover, was slain," for Easter; "Come, Holy Ghost, Creator, come," for Whitsunday.

It is certainly an interesting fact, that these Hymns which have found their way into our worship but a few years since, should be among the few which Mr. Brogden so valued as to copy and use more

than one hundred years ago. There were, as will be remembere hymns in the Prayer Book of the Church of England, then. Clergyman was allowed to select such as he pleased.

Of the other Hymns in Mr. Brogden's book, five are sacram seven for Morning and Evening, and two "a longing for glory." C these, after many changes, is well known now. And it may n uninteresting to see how it stood at the time when Mr. Br copied it into his selection:

Jerusalem, my happy home,
When shall I come to thee!
When shall my labors have an end!
Thy joys when shall I see!
Since Heaven is with glories fill'd,
And never ceasing joys;
How gladly should I quit this life,
For one which never cloys.

Reach down, O Lord, thine arm of grace
And cause me to ascend
Where congregations ne'er break up
And Sabbaths have no end.
When wilt thou come to me, O Lord!
O come, my Lord, most dear;
Come nearer, nearer, nearer, still,
I'm well when thou art near.

My dear Redeemer is above,
Him will I go to see;
All, all my friends in Christ below
Shall soon come after me.
Jerusalem! my happy home,
O! how I long for thee:
Then shall my labors have an end,
When once thy joys I see.

Nor has our Evening Hymn, "Now from the altar of our he undergone less changes since Mr. Brogden's days—he has it fro Burket, thus:

Now from the altar of our hearts,
Let *fuming incense rise:*
Assist me, Lord, to offer up
My evening sacrifice.

Lord, watch and guard me when I sleep,
I humbly, thee, implore:
Let angels *my protectors be,*
This night and evermore.

Into thy hands do I commit
My spirit, as thy due;
For thou, O Lord, created it
And hast redeem'd it too.

The last two verses, as the hymn stands in our Prayer Book, a last two of another evening hymn in Mr. Brogden's Prayer Book, are preceded there by three other stanzas. We cannot res temptation to copy one more hymn—"The Welcome Evening"—w it would seem, by the Rev. M. W. Richards:

Let those that know no other bliss,
  Than this poor dying life can give,
Sigh when they think how short it is,
  And how precariously we live.

But thou, my soul, hast joys in store,
  May say, at ev'ry setting sun,
Courage, my heart, *now* one day more
  Of a vain, vexing life is gone.

O what is all that men call light,
  Life, music, pomp, delight and mirth,
But raving dreams and hideous night,
  Howling and spectres, Hell and death!

When will th' eternal morning dawn,
  Let in salvation and true day!
Restore sweet Salem's joys again,
  And chase this hurrying time away!

one, we think, can doubt but the hymns which one in the quiet of dy sits down and copies into his book, are those which he admires res. It is this fact that gives these hymns and this book an inter- hey show us the man, how Christian were his tastes and longings, s heart's affections. They speak well for the Rector of All-Hallow's undred and twenty years since, and give us his religious character. book which has called forth so much notice, was evidently his -companion in his pastoral work, and lets us see something how ormed it and with what spirit he engaged in it.

1751, Mr. Brogden became the Rector of Queen Anne Parish, George's County—the Parish immediately adjoining All-Hallow's west. Here he succeeded the Rev. Jacob Henderson. Mr. Hen- had been the Rector there for more than forty years; and for ive years of that time he had been the Bishop of London's Com- y in the Province. Dr. Hawks, in his account of the Church in nd, has furnished us with a very interesting account of him.

e years after Mr. Brogden took charge of this Parish, he preach- published a sermon, a copy of which is before us, presented by the on of the Rev. Thomas Cradock, a sketch of whom was put in the mber of the Review of 1854. This sermon brings Mr. Brogden us in a different light from what we have been before looking at n which, as we shall see, he well sustains himself.

754, Nov. 5, on the Anniversary of the deliverance from the Gun- r Plot, for which there is a special Service provided in the English Book, he preached a sermon which was published in a small quarto amphlet of forty-seven pages. The title page is this, "Popish nconvenient to mankind, and unsuitable to the laws of Christ—A N preached in St. Barnabas' Church, Queen Anne Parish, on the November, 1754, by William Brogden, Rector of the said in Prince George's County."

letter prefixed to it, addressed to the Vestry and other inhabit- the Parish, he says, "I have the charity to believe, that many r Church would abhor popery, could they persuade themselves

that it espoused and practised the horrid things we are able to prove against it. Popery is always the same—always bent upon amassing wealth and power, upon ruling men's consciences, sense and reason, and upon extirpating all that oppose its errors. But when it wants power to put these schemes in practice, it has the policy to truckle to the times and stoops to wear a disguise! And this is the reason, that in Protestant countries it is never shown in its true colors to protestants—and perhaps to but few papists themselves."

We should be glad to quote from the advertisement which follows, his answers to the objections—'that the Laity have no business with the Scriptures'—and 'that our translation of them is false'—but pass on to the sermon itself. The text is Gal. iv, 17–18.

His method is that of keeping to the Apostle's words—remarking at the end of his introduction, "that the general design of the text was to caution the Galatian converts against the snares and wiles of certain false teachers crept in among them, who, pretending great affection, endeavored to draw them away from their own proper teachers that they might become adherents to themselves, and upon this he recommends *zeal in a good cause*—zeal both in maintaining the *true* and in guarding against the approaches of a *false* religion." Zeal, he remarks, "is a complicated affection. It loves GOD for himself—and mankind for his sake: but hates what there is reason to believe he hates. It desires GOD and all things that may glorify Him—but is averse to every counsel or practice, that would prevent the soul's union with Him. . . . . Let knowledge and charity accompany zeal, and there is no danger that it can ever be too fervent in defense of a *good cause;* but if it be separated from these, though the cause were *good*, it degenerates into a mere brutal fierceness, contrary to the genius of the Christian religion. Such is the zeal of the *Roman* church—it has neither a proper *object*, nor is it managed in a Christian *manner*.

They zealously affect you. It is known to the world with how much zeal the popish emissaries endeavor to bring men over to their way; "compassing sea and land to make proselytes." This he goes on at some length to show, and adds, "That zeal cannot be good which intends to oblige men to ignorance contrary to the design of Christ's religion," and refers to Mal. ii, 7, Luke xv, 14, Rom. xv, 14, 1 Cor. i, 5, 2 Tim. iii, 16, Acts xvii, 11, John v, 39, "which makes use of concealments and equivocations, seeks forgeries, false miracles, perjuries, murder, and every kind of the worst sort of political wisdom to accomplish their ends. These things I mention from well attested facts in history. Their low artifices among us, few can be unacquainted with. . . . . But this certainly belongs to me to take notice of—that they have hardly any instances of success in their designs, but depend upon women. Women are their surest instruments and the life of their mission." In a note respecting *equivocations*, he remarks that "the oath of a full papist can be no security to protestants, since the Council of Constance has made it a ruled case that *faith is not to be kept with heretics.* Anno 1416, Sess 19."

"But these are not the worst of the methods that the zealots of the

Roman Church make use of to gain men over to their side, though these are bad enough. Their plottings against the public peace and endeavors to unhinge government that they may get it into their own hands are notorious, as well as the unchristian methods taken by them to accomplish those ends. . . . .

"No one can be ignorant what a handle the Romanists make of the *differences* among protestants. We own there are differences; we lament them, and heartily wish they could be removed. Yet of all people, the papists have the least reason to make this objection, seeing there are few differences of protestants, but are found among them. ('Have I not known a Jesuit and Sorbonist fall together by the ears themselves in defending their own religion?' Papists as well as protestants have their disputes about divine *decrees*, *grace*, and *works*. Bishops *by divine right*, *&c.* They have their *Quietists* and *Bourignonists*, if they are not the same; *Scotists* against *Thomists*, and to name no more, *Dominicans* against *Franciscans*,) besides some in which a protestant can have no concern, (such are their squabblings about the immaculate conception of the *Virgin Mary*. Whether the *infallibility* lies in the Pope, or general Council, or in both together—the *modus* of the corporal presence in the Sacrament,—the *matter* and *form* of their five new invented Sacraments,—and many other trifling disputes, wherein they are forever wrangling among themselves.) But let a man acknowledge the *supremacy* of the Pope, and the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation, and now and then make a show of joining in their outward forms, he may believe what he will without danger. We see then what their zeal tends to; not to bring us into a safer and better condition, but to increase their numbers, exalt their Pope, and to enlarge his wealth and dominion." pp. 24, 25.

("A *toleration* clogged with any restrictions, will never content the *Jesuits*. It is true that they do not lay their claim so high at first; but the grand point they aim at, is to be uppermost; and when they once get an entrance, they never leave working by all means possible, till that end is attained.") p. 26.

"*They would exclude you.* It is an ordinary artifice of deceivers to sow seeds of difference and disesteem betwixt pastors and people. As long as these are united in affection, there is little danger; but let them be once separated, and unless people are thoroughly fixed in a resolution grounded upon knowledge, they may become an easy prey to every bold seducer. Your ministers, it is true, are faulty; they own it; and it cannot be otherwise, because they are but men. No doubt they might be better than they are, and I pray God they may. But as it is I am bold to say, that for real and substantial piety, and a rational zeal for God and the true good of souls, *protestant* ministers do as much exceed those *Roman* as they are exceeded by them in form and show." p. 30.

"These are the teachers which the Roman emissaries would *exclude* us from, that you might *affect them.*" He then speaks of, 1st, "their *vices*—the making gain of things sacred and spiritual—exercising merchandise of souls and a trade for sins, abusing the belief of futurity for an increase of wealth. These are contrary to the religion of Jesus

Christ and prove all to be false apostles, who make them their practice. It is plain that the Roman clergy continually gripe, by these and all possible ways, insomuch that some of their *begging orders* are at this time able to buy out some petty kings. During the domination of the *Roman* clergy in *England*, they had above one-third part of the lands of the kingdom in their possession." pp. 32, 33.

"2. Ambition is contrary to the genius of Christianity, and most of all, ambition in the clergy. But that this is the spirit of the *Roman* clergy, and especially of the *Jesuits*, is evinced by their continual endeavors to have a share in the politics of every court that gives them the smallest opening." p. 34.

"3. I must mention the *cruelty* of the *Roman* clergy. A system such as theirs that cannot bear the test of Scripture and reason, I must confess is in need enough of the support of racks and fires. But the religion of Jesus will admit of no such props. Our Saviour subdued the world by love and meekness. Gentleness and long suffering are fruits of his spirit; and as far as any person departs from these, so far he departs from Christianity. The gospel of Christ is at the utmost distance from every thing that looks like an allowance of murdering men for their opinions, and breathes nothing but tenderness even towards enemies. But the doctrine of the church of *Rome* contradicts it both in its declarations and practice." p. 36. This Mr. B. goes on at length to show. The facts mentioned are horrible.

"*It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing.* The best cause in the world cannot justify dishonest or barbarous means of defense and propagation. These are popish methods, and fit only for such a cause as theirs; but protestants abhor them, and by their principles must ever do so. Yet they ought to abhor *indifference* too. As our religion is founded upon a strict and rational inquiry into the Word of God, and we are satisfied upon reasonable grounds that our cause is good, none better, it is a duty to defend it with a hearty zeal. A lukewarm Christian is odious to God; and indifference and vacillation the ready way to overturn our religion and constitution, and eat out our own peace. We are commanded to contend earnestly for the faith—to be zealous for what is good, not to be of a wavering and uncertain mind, as it were divided between God and the world, like men who are swayed by their own particular interests more than by a sincere regard for the glory of God, the good of souls, or safety of the Commonwealth. Yet this zeal must be tempered with charity. Moderation is a Gospel duty, and therefore is the avowed profession and practice of protestant churches." pp. 40, 41.

"And though we know so well what these men—the papists—would do with us, could their hands go with their hearts, our religion teaches us to live *at peace* with them, could they persuade themselves to do so with us; remembering the precept, if it be possible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men. But this may be impossible. If our enemies will not be at peace with us, but upon condition of our agreeing to their encroachment, and sitting still while we behold them under-

ining our constitution, a Christian is equally bound not to cultivate eace with them upon these terms. We are indeed for peace with men, ut *we will not be at war with* God *for sake of that peace.* Could they ave patience to see protestants do their duty, in standing up for their eligion and rights, there would be nothing to interrupt a mutual peace, r on our side there is no want of inclination to pay civil respects and o good offices to all men, without a desire to give them disturbance. ut if they will insist for more, if they will have us to be blind and umb while they are twisting cords to bind us, it is the business of every an to oppose them, let what will follow." pp. 42, 43. "As papists are y their very principles restless and unquiet, we ought to be upon our ard. God and our religion require us not to be indifferent. Our milies, our posterities, and our own souls in a manner cry to us to efend our cause with courage. In such a cause dangers and ill usage o but whet a brave mind, while the timorous and lukewarm sink poorly nder their fears. We have truth and right on our side; let us unite, y brethren, in its defense. Papists can have no advantage against us ut what our differences give them; and it has always been their policy o foment them. This was the express design of instituting schools at . *Omer* and some other towns in *Flanders.* (Great numbers of youth elonging to *English* papists, are sent to these seminaries; and they ake it a point to prevail on protestants to send their sons to them, by e bait of getting learning at a small expense. But this allowance ridently endangers our civil and religious establishment. It divides nd weakens the nation, by propagating a succession of intestine ene- ies, who are the more dangerous for those sentiments of contempt and eeds of hatred and malice wherewith Jesuit instructors fail not to in- pire them, against all *real* protestants. Hence the youth brought up i those seminaries must be looked upon as so many members lost to e commonwealth and to true religion. Papists boast much of these chools.") p. 44.

"To conclude, let us be particularly attentive to the demands of this ure religion which we profess, and labor to live holy to the Lord. his is the best way to express our gratitude for the divine mercies, and e surest ground to expect the continuance of His favor. By this will e confuted the mean reproaches of our adversaries, and their faction in me be weakened. The first reformed gained upon the world by the oliness of their lives, and the same argument will always be prevail- g, being easily understood of all—being demonstrative and experi- ental. We justly boast of our liberty to look into the *Scriptures.* Let e not neglect that liberty; if we do, we fall into the very error that we ondemn in the papists, though with this difference, their church is in ult in their ignorance, but your Church is not in yours. We boast of esus Christ as our only *Head* and Lord. Let us then observe and do hat things He commands, both as to faith and piety towards God and ood will and charity to men." p. 47.

Our extracts from this sermon have been large—but they will repay s in showing the spirit and character of their author. The italics are

his own, but what is included in parenthesis are in the sermon foot-notes. The parts selected do not perhaps best show either his talents or his acquirements; but we could not give here all even that we desired. The sermon, as a whole, shows Mr. Brogden to have been not only a man of piety and of an independent and unflinching spirit, but also to have been a well read historian, a fine classical scholar, and conversant with the French.

Mr. Brogden continued in his Parish, in Prince George's County, till his death, which took place in the year 1770—the year in which his friend Cradock, of Baltimore County, died—having served in the ministry of his divine Master thirty-five years. That he was one of the lights of the Church in Maryland, his piety and his principles alike show. His talents were of a high grade, and his learning was extensive, both Theological and Classical, as well as general. And we would that we had more of the incidents of his life to record.

He left behind him, it is said, a very valuable library, most of which was presented by the present resident in the old parsonage, to Bishop Johns of Virginia, whose estate is near Mr. Brogden's. But a valuable remnant still remains. None of his manuscripts, however, are now known to be in existence, except the volumes which we have mentioned, and from one of which extracts have been so liberally made. But these which remain make us regret that the others are lost.

At his death he left two daughters, one of which was married, and four sons—the eldest of which inherited his estate in Ann Arundel County, whose sons, Dr. William, and D. McCullough Brogden, Esq., still reside there. This eldest son, Major William Brogden, died in 1824, at the age of eighty-three.

In the Revolution, Major Brogden was found on the side of the liberty of his country, in whose service he entered when called on as Captain of a volunteer company. But he did not abandon the Church of his fathers. He was a member of the Diocesan Convention a number of times, and was one of those who signed the ratification of the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese upon its final organization. And thus we have another instance furnished us of an ante-revolutionary clergyman whose descendants were found steadfast to their country and their Church in the day of their peril. Not that there were not others so found, for many of the Whigs of the Revolution were Churchmen, and the Church was saved from its utter destruction by them, under God, and not by others.

Art. VIII.—BOOK NOTICES.

LAIN Commentary on the Four Holy Gospels, Intended Chiefly for Devotional Reading. In two vols. 8vo. Complete from the London edition. iladelphia: H. Hooker.

e are sorry we cannot say in the outset, who the author of this Commenia. One who has so many gifts of grace and learning as adorn his pages, object of interest to the public.

work ever written upon the Holy Gospels has, in our opinion, so many ts and attractions for Churchmen; and it contrasts so gratefully with the mentaries which are coming into common use, that we shall content lves with stating some of its excellences as plainly and as briefly as we

We think it would surprise many persons to know to what extent such s as Barnes' "Notes" have crept into the public and private libraries of hurch, and how far Pelagian errors have silently spread among our people such sources.

e plan and motives of the work are fully set forth in the author's Preface. qualifications may be clearly inferred from his own estimate there stated, e nature and difficulty of the work in hand. In a word, he seeks to find rue Interpretation of the Primitive Church, and in doing so, uses as aids sults of modern learning, despising nothing that can throw light on the d Text, and bring out its Divine meaning. In the many years of preparafor his work, he appears to have directed his reading and enquiries to this nd. The fruits of his study are apparent on every page. Hardly an terse, or striking remark in illustration of the text, occurs in any eminent or, ancient or modern, which he does not bring to adorn and illustrate his

His quotations are remarkable as seeming always to be the very words ould have used, never made to show learning or fill vacant spaces. Among authors he quotes oftenest, we may mention Mill, French, Moberly, ams, Hooker, Leighton, Pearson, Andrews, and the Greek and Latin ers.

e most manifest grace of the writer is a spirit of enlarged charity, coupled a constant and prayerful reliance on the Divine Spirit for light and direc-

It is most profitable to the reader to observe with what reverence he ys handles the Word of God. It is to him as His audible and certain ance. No book that we can point to, puts so much honor upon the Word, , example and sacrifice of Christ. Every word, and look, and action of is full of instruction; and is treated as a storehouse of wisdom and grace. chapter in the Gospels under his treatment, becomes a living picture of vents and actors in it. Scripture is made everywhere to enliven and inter-Scripture. The events, persons and teaching of the Old Testament are to confirm and cast light upon those of the New. The comments, with eferences backwards and forwards, are one of the best Harmonies of the els to be found. The author's wisdom in the Scriptures is also very rkable, as shown in the aptness and frequency of his quotations of one or event to illustrate another. It seems as if his mind and heart were aid with the Scriptures, and thought, affection and memory sprang up in as their life. We consider this the singular excellence of the Commentary, n which "wisdom is justified of her children." The wisdom, the love, atience, the gentleness, the grace of Christ, make up the metal in the links e chain by which the author would draw men to the faith and imitation rist. With him the graces of the Spirit have the colors and combinations beauty.

We have said enough of the tone and of the moral and intellectual q of the Commentary. We will conclude with some remarks on its harm agreement with the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. The w the Church are often quoted, to show their exact accordance with the v Christ, and everywhere is she shown to be Primitive and Catholic Teaching and Worship. The reader is struck with the aptness and for which this agreement is illustrated.

On the Ministry and Sacraments of the Church, he expends much ti learning. Every step he takes is guarded by caution and prayer. Hi are not extreme, and have no marks of partisanship. They are in the n Primitive Teaching, as he esteems the Prayer Book to be. On all the p her distinctive teaching, the mind of the Church, all the way from the A is carefully traced, and her well-considered words recorded. On these no author, after the early Fathers, is so often quoted as Hooker, an respect can we see that he departs from or exceeds his plainest and g received statements.

The Commentary, for the use of the Church, for confirmation of her d for encouragement of a devotional spirit, for the establishment of a w faith, for bringing the reader into an appreciable connexion with the mind of all ages, and making him a partaker in those Holy sympathie belong to the One Body of Christ,—is invaluable, and supplies one greatest wants of the times. It will prove a fountain of life and dev every family where it is read. It will increase our respect for a Churc trains us in the truth, according to the Institutions of Christ, and point us "the sure footsteps of the flock." It will also prove a most accepta valuable aid to the clergy. Its learning and interpretation, its ins towards habitual devotion, and a full consecration of our powers to the of Christ as making that service easy and effective, its happy uses Scripture, in giving point and authority to thought, are sources of tre them with which they will enrich the Church, being first themselves e thereby. Thus does real good expand and repeat itself.

Not every part of the Commentary is marked with equal ability. latter parts, and particularly in the Gospel of St. John, the author's commenting, and his resources, are most fully developed; but altoge more valuable offering to the literature and devotion of the Chu appeared for a long time. The more it is examined, the longer it is u more will its merits be seen and prized. They are real; they are divi will brighten and expand all the more for being dwelt upon. We cons work as conceived and executed in the dutiful, trusting and catholic the Church; a spirit that is most beautiful from its likeness to the S beauty and perfection, and which is never to wear out with age, or be w as a bond of perfectness in the Body of Christ.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES II. By THOMAS TON MACAULAY. Vols. 3 and 4. New York: Harpers. 1856. New T. H. Pease.

"What do you think," writes a friend, to us, "of Macaulay's new *A of the Orangery*, as I call it?" Doubtless it is a brilliant romance. the whole, there is rather more of an infusion of historical facts than th in the previous volumes.

If it be true, as has sometimes been asserted, that Mr. Macaulay's hi productions are of the character of political *brochures*, and take a colori things around, from passing events, and predominating sympathies, w say that the Church of England was looked upon with more respect politicians of the day, than when Mr. Macaulay wrote his first volumes. the other hand, Mr. Macaulay writes with only the interests of truth i then, it is clear, that further researches have made him adopt view different from those with which he wrote before. For, while he spea

almost uniform respect of the Church of England, he shows up English Puritanism, and Scotch Presbyterianism, in a way that has rarely been approached. If Sir Walter Scott's Old Mortality stirred up such an agitation in the kirk, as the heavy pages of poor Dr. M'Crie bore witness to, what tempests may not be expected from the revelations of the late member for Edinburgh? Or, at all events, granting the most favorable view possible for Mr. Macaulay and the Puritans, namely, that he writes with only truth in view, and with his sympathies what they were, still his admissions in reference to the Church, and his revelations concerning Puritanism, are as damaging to the latter, as they are unimportant to the former.

Historically, the best point in the work, is, the exceedingly clear, able, and well-put distinction between the hereditary-right Jacobitism of England, the popish Jacobitism of Ireland, and the clannish Jacobitism of the Highlands of Scotland. If this has ever been worked out at all before, it has never been done so well.

The most brilliant piece of description, to our minds, is the account of the siege of Londonderry. And the best thing, in the way of biography, is the showing up of the obstinacy, imbecility, and incurable wrongheadedness of that inconceivable idiot, James II.

Of matters of present interest, there are some instructive and striking explanations and speculations, concerning the national debt of England; and some dogmatizing after the Sir Oracle style, as silly as it is solemn, about the revival of Convocation. Very possibly, however, by the time Convocation comes up, finally, in connexion with Hoadley, Mr. Macaulay may have gained as much new light on the subject, as he has already attained on kindred ones, since the issue of his earlier volumes.

What makes us specially suspicious of Mr. Macaulay's estimate of character, is his continual reference to Burnet, a writer who was always known to be partial and prejudiced; whom, the publication of the suppressed passages of the "History of His own Times," shows to have been malicious; and whom, the researches of Mr. Napier prove to have been a coward, and a false witness, fully justifying Lord Dartmouth's severe remark: "Thus piously ends the most partial, malicious heap of scandal and misrepresentation, that was ever collected for the laudable purpose of giving a false impression of persons and things, to all future ages." "Honest Burnet," Mr. Macaulay calls him! Were he living, no doubt he would say, "Honest Macaulay!"

IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND; OR SKETCHES OF ENGLISH SCENERY AND SOCIETY. By A. CLEVELAND COXE, Rector of Grace Church, Baltimore. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 321. New York: Dana & Co.

England has been served up in so many shapes, and seasoned with such varied condiments to suit palates variously stimulated by national, political, or sectarian prejudice, that a mere book of travel in our mother country does not, by the bare announcement, excite any special interest. We require to know who the author is, before our appetite begins to take an edge. We assume beforehand that some men must, if they will at all, produce an instructive and interesting book, while others must, of necessity, compile a dull one. In the present instance, all our anticipations were favorable. For the author had shown, by his various writings, both in prose and poetry, that he possessed, in a high degree, energy, vivacity, insight, and descriptive power—just the qualities to render a book of travels interesting. Mr. Coxe set out on his tour with rare qualifications for an appreciative tour in the mother country. For he possessed a acquaintance with English geography, history, and literature, such as few American scholars can boast. No one can read this volume without being impressed with the evidence of this intimate and thorough knowledge, not gained in the course of travel, but a torch, throwing its light before to illumine the pathway of the traveler. Indeed, it is the thing which more than all else in spite of the author's attractions of style, tends to lift the book above the

range of popular sympathy, by first raising it above the range of the popular intelligence. It requires a great deal of previous knowledge of the history and literature of England to thoroughly appreciate its *sketchy* pages. The reader must be able to supply many lights and shadows of the picture himself. In this respect the author has disappointed us. He has produced a more scholarly and a less popular work than we had anticipated from his pen. Not that we doubted his ability to do the very thing he has done, but because all his former writings were in clearer sympathy with the popular mind. The author had also secured to himself peculiar facilities for seeing all that was worth seeing in England. For his sacred poetry had gone before him, and made him favorably known among both high and low. And he found a cordial welcome awaiting him, and a ready introduction into society of every rank. The point of view in this work seems to us to be two-fold. Mr. Coxe has been so thorough a student of all that relates to the England of the past, and is so closely united in intelligence and sympathy with the England that now is, and has been following along for the last twenty-five years, that it sometimes seems difficult for him to look at things from a purely American stand-point. And it seems as if he had in his mind's eye an English rather than an American reader. But then, on the other hand, there is abundant evidence that the author, although in close sympathy with all that is great and good in the English Church and nation, is a loyal American at heart.

As a literary performance, then, Mr. Coxe's volume is entitled to take high rank in the class of works to which it belongs. In fact, it reminded us pleasantly of "Eustace's Classical Tour in Italy." And substituting British for Latin authors, we might well style the work before us a "Classical Tour in England."

The author informs us in his preface, that he has purposely "foreborne to dwell on the greater evils of English Society, because these have been thoroughly discussed and exposed, as well by Englishmen as by foreigners." "He confesses, also, that he has the rather confined himself to an exhibition of the bright side of the picture, because he fears that many of his countrymen are sceptical as to its existence." Had not Mr. Coxe forestalled us by these and other considerations, we should have pointed out his passing so slightly over the social evils of our mother country, as a defect in his book. We should, however, do him injustice, if we did not remember the fact that he has often signalized in brief, but strong sentences, some of the worst evils, both in Church and State.

We are reminded, as we write, of the stayless flight of time, and the irreparable loss of opportunity. Many of the characters who stand forth in living colors on our author's canvas, belong already to history, and can be no more seen by the traveler. The Duke of Wellington, seen several times, and once under very interesting circumstances—Rogers, the poet, whose "breakfasts" were shared in the society of the learned and the great—Sir Harry Inglis, that pattern of an English Churchman of the old School—Talfourd, the poet judge, who died, uttering such noble words of conciliation—all have passed from life's busy scene!

SERMONS FOR THE TIMES. By CHARLES KINGSLEY, Rector of Eversley, &c. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 360. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

We are glad to see these Sermons of Mr. Kingsley. His former works, especially his "*Alton Locke*," and his "*Yeast*," indicated social affinities or idiosyncrasies of some sort, yet precisely where he would place the Church, as the regenerator of society, did not clearly appear. His Sermons settle that question. Although he is said to belong to the "Broads," yet he does not undervalue the Organic Institutions or Sacraments of the Church. He is evidently an anti-technicalist in doctrine, and holds Christianity rather as a Life than as a Belief. Now the latter may exist without the former; but that

the Life can be maintained without a right Belief, is contrary to observation and sound reason. Thus, in his Sermon on "Justification by Faith," Jesus Christ as the distinct object of that faith, is not once recognized. Faith seems to be spoken of as a synonym for the whole Gospel Dispensation. The term Faith is sometimes so used in the New Testament, undoubtedly. But yet, Jesus Christ as the express, distinct object of the faith of a penitent soul, is a cardinal truth never to be lost sight of. The New Testament everywhere so presents HIM. The Early Liturgies, and the writings of the Early Fathers, are full of this glorious, vital doctrine. The Gospel never reaches men's hearts, nor satisfies the interior wants of the soul, when CHRIST is obscured. The Papists conceal HIM behind a usurping priesthood; and the Pelagians do the same thing in another way. But both, alike, desiccate the Gospel, and rob it of its chief glory and power. JESUS CHRIST is a Fountain, as well as a Life and an Example, a Remedy as well as a Pattern.

And so also, there are expressions in Mr. Kingsley's fifteenth Sermon on the "Life of God," which seem to deny that "Christ's Death was a sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction" to the Father, for the sins of the whole world. And there are, throughout the volume, positions taken which are extremely unguarded, and the tendency of which, will be to unsettle men's minds, and lead the unwary astray.

And yet, there is so much of what we believe to be the true spirit of Christianity in these Sermons, that we cannot think the author intends to ignore doctrines so essential as those to which we have alluded. We suppose him to be only assailing that dead, and dry, and barren Faith which has filled the world with infidelity, which is so common among the nominally orthodox. With his keen perception of the evils of Society, he sees the great and all-sufficient remedy to be alone found in a living reception of the Gospel and Church of Christ; and this, we suppose to be the key-note to his Sermons, and to the man. This is his philosophy. And hence, we may learn to appreciate the opposition which his book will have to encounter.

His style is, at times, exceedingly familiar and colloquial. No American preacher would dare stoop so low, nor would he be tolerated if he did. Notwithstanding his capabilities in the way of fine writing, the careless reader would see little proof of such resources in these Sermons. We have marked an extract from his Sermon on "The True Gentleman," but omit it for want of room. We advise our clergy to read that Sermon, to preach it, to imbue their hearers with its spirit. It is exactly suited to the peculiar wants of society in our country. It holds forth the true type of the perfect Gentleman, such as we wish might be presented before every Christian in our own day.

We have alluded to what we think is the great fault in the Sermons of Mr. Kingsley, as it is also of the School to which he is said to belong. We have no patience with self-opinionated innovators on such points as these. And yet, it would be most unwise in us, not to recognize the perhaps forgotten truth, which these men have seized hold of, and in the bold presentation of which, their whole strength consists.

SQUIER'S CENTRAL AMERICA. Notes on Central America, particularly the States of Honduras and San Salvador; their Geography, Topography, Climate, Population, Resources, Productions, &c., &c., and the proposed Inter-oceanic Railway. By E. G. SQUIER, formerly Chargé d'Affaires of the United States to the Republics of Central America. With original maps and illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 397. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

For many reasons this is a most important and timely work. Mr. Squier's long familiarity with the country, and his capability to judge intelligently upon the subjects on which he speaks, render his book of the greatest value, and it may and will be appealed to as a work of authority. Central America is situated on the isthmus which unites the two continents of North America and South

America, and extends from the southern border of Mexico to the northern boundary of New Granada; and it spreads from that part of the Atlantic ocean which is called Caribbean sea, to the shore of the Pacific ocean. Central America is constituted by the independent States of Guatamala, San Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica. These States exclude the Balize or British Honduras, and include the Mosquito Coast. Mr. Squier, present the following table of the area and population of the five States:

	Area of Square Miles.	Population
Guatamala,	43,380	850,000
Honduras,	39,600	350,000
San Salvador,	9,594	394,000
Nicaragua,	49,500	300,000
Costa Rica,	13,590	125,000
Total,	155,664	2,019,000

Mr. Squier represents this country as one of great beauty and attraction, especially in the interior and on the Pacific coast, rich in all manner of resources temperate and healthful. The sea breezes and the contiguous mountains render the climate delightful. The recently ascertained fact, that an inter-oceanic Railway may be easily constructed from the Bay of Honduras to the Bay of Fonseca, a distance of about 150 miles, thus saving, at least, seven days time on the Panama route to California, has given new importance to Central American affairs, and Great Britain is now as usual exhausting her diplomatic skill to obtain the lion's share in the spoils. By the terms of the Clayton and Bulwer Treaty, of April 9, 1850, our Government agreed, that "neither party will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the contemplated canal.

Neither will ever erect or maintain any fortification commanding the same or the vicinity thereof.

Neither will occupy, or fortify, or colonize, assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Musquito Coast, or any part of Central America.

Neither will use any protection which either affords or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have, to or with any State or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America.

Neither will take advantage of any intimacy or use any alliance, connection or influence that either may possess with any State or people through whose territory the canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for its own citizens or subjects, any unequal rights or advantage of commerce or navigation."

And yet, on the 17th of July, 1850, thirteen days after the conclusion of the treaty of 1850, a proclamation was issued by the British Government, constituting the Honduras Islands of Ruatan, Bonacca, Utilla, Barbaret, Helene, and Moerat, a colony under the name of the Colony of the Bay Islands; and this, on the ground that they belonged to the Balize settlement. The islands of Ruatan and Bonacca are said by a British geographer to be, by reason of their fine harbors good soils, fine air and abundant animals, as well as their commanding ground proverbially known in that part of the world as the garden of the West Indies and the Key to Spanish America and a new Gibraltar.

By a similar mode of reasoning, Great Britain now pleads a similar prior claim to the Honduras coast, in virtue of a treaty with the Musquito Indians thus laying claims to the control of this Railway route. Both these claims Mr. Squier disposes of in the most thorough and satisfactory manner. If Great Britain prefers to regard the treaty of 1850 as null and void, we hope our Government will not throw the slightest obstacle in the way. For colonies and emigration from the United States would soon bring those important regions within our own control as of right they ought to be.

Mr. Squier's book is full of information concerning Honduras and San Salvador, their inhabitants, history, government, religion, antiquities, and ruins; their productions, especially their vast mineral wealth, their luxuriant vegetation, their harbors and ports, and their present and prospective importance. Geologically, this whole country is of the greatest interest; and alike in respect to the animal, vegetable, and mineral creation, in no part of the world has the Creator been more lavish of His gifts. Mahogany, Rosewood, Coffee, Sugar-cane, Indigo, Oranges, &c., are among the vegetable products. Mr. Squier is a man of keen discernment, of strong common sense, and a fine naturalist, and they who read his former work on Nicaragua, published by the Appletons, in 1852, will not be disappointed in the work before us. His remarks on the religious and political institutions of the country, and the developments of races, and the laws which govern them, deserve attentive consideration.

It is, however, to the proposed Railroad over the Honduras route, that Mr. Squier devotes special attention. Every part of the route has been thoroughly examined; and by means of maps, plans, and tables, and distances, &c., the project is intelligibly presented to the reader. The grades are easy, the maximum being only *fifty-five* feet per mile; while on the New York and Erie road it is *sixty*, and on the Baltimore and Ohio road *one hundred and sixteen*. He represents the sailing distance from New York to San Francisco as shorter by this route than by Nicaragua or Tehuantepec, and at least a thousand miles shorter than by Panama. The advantages of this route and the facilities for constructing the road are described with particularity. The cost of its construction he estimates at a sum not exceeding $7,000,000. A liberal charter for the road has been obtained from the Honduras Legislature, bearing date April 28, 1854. Mr. Squier has fairly made out a very strong case, on paper, beyond all question. We ought to add, that the maps of the country hitherto in use are of British origin. Those in this volume are well done, and, we doubt not, are trustworthy.

There is another side to this subject which, however, he has not touched. We are glad to observe that the Church is turning her attention to Spanish America, as missionary ground. We hope to see the day when she shall plant her Missions in Amapala, Tegucigalla, and other important towns in San Salvador and Honduras. Romanism, as in California and Mexico, has proved itself a curse to the people, and the people have found it out. So strong was the public feeling against Popery, that in 1832 the Monks were expelled, the convents suppressed, and religious property confiscated, and the *prestige* of that Church was effectually broken down. The effect of that religion on public morals has not been one whit better than heathenism. Whether our own true branch of the Church will have wisdom and zeal enough to do her duty to Central America, remains to be seen. That we shall be treated with very excellent resolutions and eloquent speeches, is probable.

REVIEW OF THE SEARCH OF TRUTH. Republished from the Protestant Churchman. THE PROTESTANT CHURCHMAN *vs.* THE SEARCH OF TRUTH. A Defense.

The first of these productions comes to us in the dignified form of a Pamphlet; the second in the very humble guise of a loose half-sheet. How the Author of the former came to rescue his lucubrations from the fugitive form in which they first appeared, as Editorial articles in the *Protestant Churchman*, can only be accounted for by the fact that the prayer has not yet been answered in his case,

> "O wad some power the giftie gie us,
> To see oursels as others see us."

The work is a labored, and in some respects an ingenious attempt, to make the Author of the "Search of Truth" say what he does not say, and then to belabor him for saying it. The confident and assured tone of the writer is well calculated to produce effect, and to impose upon those who do not take the trouble to examine carefully his positions. Very few readers will take that

trouble, and therefore Mr. CRAIK has done well to take it for them. His "Defense" is a patient and thorough refutation of every objection urged by this Reviewer against his book, and a very plain exposure of the inanity of one of the principal points of positive doctrine insisted on in the Review. All this is done in a mild and purely argumentative way, which doubtless made it the more provoking to the sensibilities of the critic, who rejoins in a peevish article, in which he complains of discourtesy, and attributes to Mr. Craik his own too apparent soreness.

We may at a future time treat at large of some of the important questions raised in the "Search of Truth," but we cannot forbear now to commend the work again to the careful study of the Ministers and members of the Church, and of all enquirers after "the way of Salvation." We know that some of our Bishops have spoken of the work in terms of commendation which would surprise those who have not thoroughly mastered the work itself. And we know of nobody who need to quarrel with Mr. Craik, except the sticklers for the "*five points*" of Calvinism, who will have it that God made the greater part of the human family on purpose to gratify Himself in their endless and irremediable damnation.

LECTURES ON THE MORNING PRAYER. By ROBERT A. HALLAM, D. D., Rector of St. James' Church, New London, Conn. Philadelphia: Herman Hooker. 1856. 12mo. pp. 360.

We think this to be one of the most valuable books of the Church press in our day. It has sterling merits which are not indicated by its title. It is a sensible book. By which we mean it was written by a man who has such a thing as common-sense about him. We venture to say that he has not the slightest sympathy with either of those two classes, of the "Rose Water and the Water Gruel" Schools; one of whom make it a point of conscience never to pray in public without managing to get their backs to the people, and the other, without getting their backs to the altar—each of whom herald their exploits with an eclat worthy of martyrdom. If Dr. Hallam were asked whether he is a "High Churchman," or a "Low Churchman," we presume he would reply that he knows no such distinction,—and that it would be equally impertinent to ask him whether he is a "High" Christian, or a "Low" Christian, a "High" Philanthropist or a "Low" Philanthropist. Bishop Griswold used to say, that men who boast of their Churchmanship usually have very little of it to boast of; he might have said the same thing of men who perpetually boast how "Evangelical" and "Pious" they are. The celebrated John Randolph once hit off this species of *cant* in Congress so effectually that it was not repeated for a whole Session. Dr. Hallam is a Churchman, and an honest one; and of course he is Catholic in his spirit, and Evangelical in his teaching. His book indicates a maturity of thought, a breadth of grasp, an earnestness of purpose, a keen perception of the multiform heresies, doctrines and tendencies of the times, which will surprise those who do not know him. And it is in this aspect that the book is specially valuable. It is emphatically a book for the times. And yet it is a book for all times. Written in the very house, and in the very study which good old Bishop Seabury once occupied, it is such a work as that true hearted man would have invoked God's blessing upon. Dr. Hallam presents those views of Doctrine, Sacraments, Worship and Discipline which have always been held, not only in Connecticut but elsewhere, as agreeing with the Holy Scriptures and Primitive Antiquity. For example, his Lecture upon "The Absolution" presents that Ministerial act, we think, in its true light, both as distinguished from the absolute judicial sentence of the Papist, on the one hand, and the unauthoritative declaration of a mere layman on the other. Anything essentially short of Dr. Hallam's view does not come up to the spirit of Holy Scripture, the Primitive Church or the Prayer Book. Several of these Lectures would make excellent Tracts for general distribution. Never have we seen the Romish "Confessional" more truthfully described, either as to its nature or its

dency. The Seventeenth Lecture on "the Christian Salvation" gives a most ching analysis of the two opposite theories now so prevalent, to wit: of ith without Works, and of Works without Faith. Dr. Hallam's style is terse d nervous, with an occasional piquancy which effectually demolishes an rdity or an error with a single word. There is also, now and then, a warmth d glow of fervor which rises into true eloquence; but it is always the elo-nce of thought, or of true chastened emotion, never the mere jingle of sono-s words and vapid rhetoric; an attempted imitation of Macaulay, the con-tions of the Sybil without her inspiration.

We have spoken earnestly and decidedly of these Lectures, because the work me which ought not to be forgotten among the countless issues of the modern ss. As an exposition of the Prayer Book it is sufficiently historical and planatory. Its effect will be to strengthen attachment and reverence for the urch, which is Christ's mystical Body, and to make its readers living mem-rs of that Body. We understand that about one hundred and fifty copies of s work have been sold in a single parish.

The work is appropriately dedicated to the Venerable Presiding Bishop, the . Rev. Dr. Brownell, Senior Bishop of Connecticut.

HISTORY OF ALL NATIONS, FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO 1854; OR, UNIVERSAL HISTORY. In which the History of every Nation, Ancient and Modern, is separately given. By S. G. GOODRICH, Consul to Paris, and Author of several Works of History, Parley's Tales, &c. Auburn, N. Y.: Miller, Orton & Mulligan. 1854. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1221.

We do not hesitate to say that these massive volumes from that popular thor, Mr. Goodrich, form one of the most complete and perfect compends of story, chronology, geography and biography that we have ever seen. Its se and compact style—its clear and graphical description, aided by maps and storial illustrations, together with its comprehensive view of the principal nts and characters which have marked the different periods of the world's story—must recommend it alike to the general reader and the scholar. But ong the chief excellencies of this work will be found two, which will be re particularly acknowledged as invaluable. We mean the general arrange-nt by which the history of each nation is presented separately—instead of ronologically—and the full and complete index to the whole work—thus mbining an admirable text-book with an agreeable history. Indeed, it may said that no book combining these two qualities, in the present degree, has er been issued from the press. It is truly a historical library in itself, and e Author may justly claim preëminence in presenting its lessons in the most tractive style. It has a map of nearly every country on the globe, (70 maps all,) and is beautifully illustrated with several hundred engravings. It is bstantially and elegantly bound in two large volumes, and contains more than relve hundred double column pages. It contains internal evidence of having en the result of many years of careful literary labor. As a book of reference Ancient and Modern History, we have seen nothing so convenient. The ader will remember that it is an Encyclopedia of History as commonly receiv-l, rather than a perfect detail of History, which of course, could find no place ithin such a compass.

LIFE IN BRAZIL: OR, A JOURNAL OF A VISIT TO THE LAND OF THE COCOA AND THE PALM. With an Appendix, containing Illustrations of Ancient South American Arts, in recently discovered Implements and Products of Domestic Industry, and Works in Stone, Pottery, Gold, Silver, Bronze, &c. By THOMAS EWBANK. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 469. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The sources of reliable information respecting South American Countries are w, as we have been taught by our own experience. Mr. Ewbank's explora-

tions were mostly confined to Rio and vicinity. Rio is already an important and flourishing city. Situated just within the tropics, on a most magnificent bay, embosomed by lofty mountains, it is the capital of an empire 300,000 square miles larger than the United States and all the Territories, and the seat of a most extensive and increasing commerce. The city contains about 400,000 inhabitants; is lighted with gas; has excellent water flowing down from the adjacent mountains; is well paved; has many lines of omnibuses and steamers, an excellent police, many hospitals, three daily papers, a fine market, several theatres, an opera house, many public schools and hotels, and over fifty churches; and, in short, all the improvements of a first class capital. Much of the author's book is devoted to a description of the present condition of the Romish Church. Of the Priests he says, "the depth of their pollution I should not have suspected," &c.; and he adduces the testimony of respectable natives, "that the Priesthood of this Country is superlatively corrupt;" that "their secret crimes have made this city a Sodom;" that "with country priests concubinage is universal," &c., &c. He says, "In whatever light the physique of Romanism may appear to others, it is full of interest to me. Almost as purely heathen as before the advent of Christ, it is a living and luminous exponent of pagan mysteries and ceremonies. Restore the old terms 'temples' and 'gods' for 'churches' and 'saints,' (they are strictly synonymous,) and there is scarcely aught in it but what was in common use ages before the times of the Cæsars."

He gives almost incredible accounts of the mingling of sacred and profane things; and yet it is so in Spain and Mexico. Here is a programme in honor of the FESTIVAL OF THE HOLY GHOST.

"The Brotherhood of the Divine Holy Ghost of San Gonçalo (a small village across the Bay) will hold the Feast of the Holy Ghost on the 31st instant with all possible splendor. Devout persons are invited to attend, to give greater pomp to this act of religion. On the 1st proximo, the Feast of the Most Holy Sacrament, with a procession in the evening, a Te Deum, and sermon. On the 2d, the feast of the patron San Gonçalo; at three P. M. there will be *brilliant horse-racing*, after which a Te Deum and magnificent fire-works."

Here is an advertised description of the entertainments in celebration of the

FEAST OF CORPUS CHRISTI.

"In the Barraca of Good Taste there will be an extraordinary divertisement on the day of the Body of God.

"In the Theatro Magico, a Representation in Three Parts: Part 1. *The Passion of our Lord*, viz, The Birth—St. Joseph—Garden of Olives—Holy Magdalen—The Tortures—St. Peter—Our Lord of the Paces—St. George—The Crucifixion—St. John Baptist—The Resurrection—The Holy Virgin. Part 2. *Cosmoramic Views.* Part 3. *Diverting Phantasmagoria:* The Sorcerer—Flying Death's Head—The Parisian Galatea—The Changed Head—Don Quixote—Walking Woman—Garden of Love and the Monster. To conclude with

"THREE CATS DANCING THE POLKA."

And we have yet another specimen of

ECCLESIASTICAL ADVERTISEMENT.

In addition to this notice in a morning paper, hand-bills soliciting alms and inviting the respectable public and devout persons to attend at the Theatre, are stuck up on the corners of streets. One has a significant mark of some person's opinion of the establishment it celebrates—a coat of mud. The house is a brothel, which, from ignorance of its character, the bishop has licensed to have a shrine in one of its rooms.

A writer in the "*Jornal*" calls on the reverend deputies in the Legislature to bring forward measures for putting an end to the official connection betwen religion, churches, and theatres, and refers to this place. From play-bills he quotes, "A tragedy for the benefit of N. S. Conceiçao in Soap Street, namely,

much-applauded drama of *The Jealous Wife*, *Dance of the Polka*, and the ie farce of *The Brother of Souls*. Again, in the Theatre of Nietherohy, the e of *The Brother of Souls* will be performed *for the benefit of souls in Pur-*ry. And recently, in the Theatre San Pedro, in this city, the same was ed *in honor of the Divine Holy Ghost of Sta. Anna*; besides others, equally ctionable, advertised daily. What a satire on religion is this! What im-lence!"

valuable Appendix gives an account of Ancient South American Arts: tery, stoneware, and works in metal under the Incas, modern carvings, &c. book contains a great number of pictorial illustrations; and adds much to knowledge of Brazil.

TAIN JAMES MONROE'S LECTURE in Hope Chapel, New York, Feb. 26, 1856, on The Creative Genius of Catholicity."

Ve see that the Romanists are seizing hold of the *Lecture Mania*, and by it trying to shape public sentiment into sympathy with Popery. Ex-Bishop s, Brownson, and others, are enunciating the boldest and stupidest absurdi- to applauding audiences. A certain Captain Monroe lately gave utterance he following. He said,—"The liberties of this country were due to Catho-ty. The English Magna Charta was obtained from King JOHN by Cardinal PHEN LANGTON and his Catholic compeers in the meadow of Runnymede. en the American colonists rose against the mother country, their cause ıld have been demoralized, if they had been without a just and indisputable ıciple of right. They rebelled, because they had rights, which were above ir allegiance—rights based upon the Magna Charta, the English Catholic stitution, which, as COKE said, brooked no sovereignty."

s we find this historical impertinence floating over the country, and in ers, too, whose Editors ought to know better than to echo such a story, it r be well, briefly, to examine the statements. What, then, are the facts? ıply these: The Barons of England did obtain *Magna Charta* from King n; and England was then nominally papal in its religion, but had not then ded itself subservient to the Pope in civil matters. The King subsequently le his submission to the Pope's Legate, and the Pope, Innocent III, claimed gland and Ireland as his own. And what then? King John had previously nd himself to the Barons and the people, by *Magna Charta*, and could not ld to the despotic demands of the Pope. And what did the Pope do? He ued his Bull, CONDEMNING *Magna Charta*, and absolving King John from his h to keep it. Here are the Pope's words: "WE UTTERLY REPROBATE AND CON-EM THIS COMPACT, AND WE FORBID THE KING TO OBSERVE IT, UNDER PAIN OF ANATH-A." (See Innocent III. Bulla, ap. Rymer, i, p. 136.) And yet England es *Magna Charta* to Rome! and we owe our liberties to Magna Charta!! d such an insult is oracularly palmed off upon the country by Capt. James nroe, and the *New York Times* silently responds *Amen* to it. And so we are have Rome set up as the great patron of liberty! and the next story will be, t the Inquisition is its very personification! Look at any country, under whole Heaven, where Popery has had full sway, as Italy, Naples, Spain, stria, Portugal, Spanish America, and see what sort of "liberty" it is that pery offers! The "liberty" of believing just what the Church believes, or ng into the dungeon! The liberty of being crushed under its iron-toothed row, and then paying for the privilege! The liberty of social bondage! of sical, mental, moral, and religious degradation!

ECTIONS FROM THE BRITISH POETS. By ELIZA WOODWORTH. With twelve illus-rations. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1856. 12mo. pp. 365.

his is a very tasteful selection from the works of about fifty of the best tish Poets, ancient and modern, from Chaucer and Spenser to Tennyson,

together with a brief sketch of the Poets themselves. It is a pleasant book for those who wish the gems of the Poets set in a coronal, which may be always at hand.

THE PRINCE OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID; Or, Three Years in the Holy City. Being a Series of the Letters of Adina, a Jewess of Alexandria, sojourning in Jerusalem in the days of Herod, addressed to her father, a wealthy Jew in Egypt, and relating, as by an eye-witness, the Scenes and Wonderful Incidents in the Life of Jesus of Nazareth, from His Baptism in Jordan to His Crucifixion on Calvary. Edited by the Rev. J. H. INGRAHAM. 480 pp. 12mo. Price $1.25. New York: Pudney & Russell. 1856.

The title page, which we give in full, is a fair description of the contents of the volume. We confess, that we always shrink from every attempt to deal artistically with the person or the character of our BLESSED LORD. We find ourselves the rather inclined to stand aloof, and to gaze with wonder and awe at HIM, as He is revealed. We dare not give loose rein to the imagination on such a theme; and we never saw a representation of the person of the GOD-MAN, which we did not feel to be a caricature of HIM. Who, though "Very Man," was yet also "VERY GOD," and "Who, although He be GOD and Man, yet He is not two, but one CHRIST." It may be our weakness that we thus confess. We know that the horrible irreverence of both extremes around us, has made us sensitive. But such is our feeling, and we would not have it otherwise. And if there be any meaning in the Second Commandment of the Decalogue, we think it applies to just such representations.

And yet, we owe it to the Rev. Mr. Ingraham, the author of this volume, to say that many most capable critics have not felt those objections to his delineations to which, in some respects, we plead guilty. Many a passage is exceedingly touching and beautiful; nor do we doubt that such exceeding familiarity with the story of our Blessed LORD, may coëxist both in the writer and the reader, with the most profound reverence. The work, we see, has already reached its eighth thousand, and the public will, we doubt not, fully appreciate the fine descriptive talents of the writer, and his laudable motive in consecrating them to the cause of religion. At any rate, the "religious world," so called, are not greatly troubled now-a-days, with the scruples to which we have given utterance.

SUNLIGHT AND HEARTHLIGHT; or, Fidelity, and other Poems. By SYLVANUS DRYDEN PHELPS. New York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman. 1856. 12mo. pp. 252.

The author of these poems is an esteemed Pastor of a respectable Baptist congregation in New Haven. His modestly written Preface shows that he is not perpetually trying to lash his Pegasus into a terrible fury, and threatening to take the heights of Olympus by storm. Indeed, we think the Preface almost too modest for the book. For there are some really fine verses in it, and we have not yet detected a single instance of false measure or bad rhythm. A Christian Lyric, beginning, "Sons of light! awake from sleeping!" has the true trumpet tone, and the finest poet of the day need not be ashamed to own it his. His versification of the "DIES IRÆ," though unequal, has much of the spirit of the original.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE REPUBLIC; briefly considered in Seven Discourses, preached in St. Peter's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., during the Winter and Spring of 1854-5. By EDWIN M. VAN DEUSEN, A. M., Rector. Pittsburgh: W. S. Haven. 1856. 12mo. pp. 153.

The importance of such occasional Discourses, out of the ordinary routine of Sunday Sermons, is very great, and the Rev. Mr. Van Deusen has done himself

and his congregation credit by consenting to the publication of the volume before us. The Discourses are national and Church-like in their tone, and are well calculated to gain attention, and reward it.

SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE. Three Prize Essays: The Great Reform, by ABEL STEVENS; The Great Question, by LORENZO WHITE; Property Consecrated, by BENJAMIN ST. JAMES FRY. 18mo. New York: Carlton & Phillips, for the Tract Society of the M. E. Church. 1856. 12mo. pp. 126, 234, 124.

This volume is the result of a prize offered by the Methodist Episcopal Tract Society, of three hundred dollars for the best Tract on Systematic Beneficence. Subsequently the sum was raised to six hundred dollars, to be given, at the discretion of the adjudicators, in one sum, or, should three Essays be selected, in sums of three hundred, two hundred, and one hundred dollars respectively. Thirty-three manuscripts were received by the committee appointed for the purpose. With entire unanimity it was agreed to award the prize of three hundred dollars to the writer of the Tract entitled, "The Great Reform," an Essay on the duty and the best method of Systematic Beneficence in the Church; the prize of two hundred dollars to the author of a Tract entitled, "The Great Question, or How shall I meet the claims of God upon my Property?" and the prize of one hundred dollars to the author of the Tract entitled, "Property Consecrated, or Honoring God with our Substance." The Essay of Mr. Stevens is very ably written, indeed, he is one of the best writers of the day. There is much uniformity in the method of argument pursued by the three writers.

While we, as Churchmen, with a vast deal of expenditure of "Appeals" of various kinds, have at last got up to about $100,000 a year, the Methodists raised last year about $260,000 for missionary objects. There is a considerable number of our largest and wealthiest parishes, who give nothing, or next to nothing, and apparently care nothing for the Missionary work.

OUR CHURCH MUSIC. A Book for Pastors and People. By RICHARD STORRS WILLIS. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 183. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

There is an old obsolete Rubric in the Prayer Book, which reads as follows:— "And further, it shall be the duty of every minister, with such assistance as he can obtain from persons skilled in music, to give order concerning the tunes to be sung at any times in his church; and especially, it shall be his duty to suppress all light and unseemly music, and all indecency and irreverence in the performance, by which vain and ungodly persons profane the service of the Sanctuary." And Mr. Willis reminds us that in Germany there once existed an old Churchly ordinance, that the Candidate for Orders should pass his examination in Church Music, as well as in Theology. There is no part of our Service so comparatively ineffective, none, the true nature and purport of which are more imperfectly appreciated, and none more fruitful in all sorts of annoyances to the Clergy than the Music of the Church. There are few of them, we suppose, who could not write some funny chapters from their own experience. Mr. Willis's book is written in a good spirit; it shows its author to be a proficient in the Science and the Art, a man of musical taste, and keenly sensible to the popular errors on the subject. His views on the character of true Church Music, and especially on the adaptation of Music to sentiment, are admirable. The book is suggestive and instructive, and as such, it especially deserves the attention of the Clergy. We would not endorse all his opinions, nor approve of all his directions; but the book is a good one.

CATALOGUE OF TRINITY COLLEGE FROM ITS FOUNDATION. Hartford, 1855.
CALENDAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE. Hartford, 1856.

Triennial Catalogues always possess for us a peculiar interest. They not only represent to us a living, present man of liberal culture, in various professions and positions of influence, guiding the course of society, and as instruments in the hands of Divine Providence shaping the destiny of humanity. But they also inspire us with solemn thoughts as we survey one by one the *starred* names of the departed, some of whom went down to their graves with the dew of youth yet glistening on their brow. Others were cut down in mid career, when the high resolve grew faint, and the strong manly heart grew still at the chill touch of the destroyer, while others sank gently to sleep after a long and splendid career of usefulness and honor.

Trinity College, whose *General Catalogue* is before us, has not yet seen years enough to allow full scope for all these reflections. Still she has twined her memories around thousands of hearts, and is destined to fill a large place in the affections of Churchmen, as time rolls on. Her Charter was granted in 1823. Her first Commencement was in 1827, when a class of ten young men received the degree of A. B. Her graduates now number 455. Of these about 160 have entered the Ministry, 92 have become Lawyers, and 45 Physicians. And there are not a few engaged in professional or other employments, who, although they pursued only a University course and did not take a degree, acquired at this Institution, either in whole or in part, that education which has fitted them for usefulness. An impression has existed in certain quarters, and has been, we cannot but think, very pertinaciously cherished, that Trinity College is a Divinity School. But there never was the slightest ground for such an idea. It is a College in the strictest sense of the term—an Institution whose aim is to train and develop the powers of the mind to mould the character so as to fit a young man either for the study of a profession or for the practical duties of a citizen. The course of studies is, in all its essential features, the same as that pursued at Harvard or Yale.

We are glad to learn that the trustees and friends of the College have resolved to go forward and organize and endow its several departments in the most thorough manner. It is, if we are rightly informed, their purpose to add an endowed professorship until the means of instruction are amply provided for in every department. As proof that these wise and generous purposes will not be suffered to languish, we may instance the *Scovil Endowment* for the chair of *Chemistry and Natural Science*, to which Professor Pynchon was elected, who is now abroad studying in the laboratories of Paris and London, in order to qualify himself for the more efficient discharge of his duties. And we learn that an effort is now in progress to raise $2000 to be sent on to Professor P. to be expended in the purchase of additional apparatus for his own department and that of Natural Philosophy. We also learn that another department,—that of *Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*—is to be created at next Commencement, and that a Committee of the Board of Trustees are now looking for the right man to fill it. In these and other signs of life and growth in this important Institution we sincerely rejoice and we commend the enlightened plans of its authorities to the favorable consideration of our readers.

UNISON OF THE LITURGY:—Being an exhibition of the harmony of the subject contained in the Collect for each of the Sundays and Holy Days of the year, with the Epistle, the Gospel, and the Lessons for that Day, and of its accordance with a corresponding topic in the Church's Catechism, and in her Articles of Religion. By ARTHUR GIFFORD, A. M. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 327. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

There is no doubt that in arranging her public Services the Church has sought both "unison" and completeness. That while there is a distinctness of tone, a certain key note for each season of Festival and Fast, so also, that the

whole cycle shall comprise all the great truths, doctrines, and duties of our holy religion. It is a beautiful conception, and one of great wisdom. Mr. Gifford has illustrated this characteristic in the appointed Services from Advent to Ash Wednesday.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND from the Accession of James II. By THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY. Vol. III and IV. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856. pp. 576, 645.

The publishers send us this Boston edition, neatly bound and well "got up," which they retail at forty cents per volume.

HARPERS' CLASSICAL LIBRARY.—The Publishers have added the three following volumes to this valuable Library.

THE HISTORY OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR. By THUCYDIDES. A new and literal version from the text of Arnold, collated with Bekker, Goller, and Poppo. By Rev. HENRY DALE. New York. 12mo. pp. 594.

HERODOTUS.—A new and literal Version from the text of *Baehr*. With a Geographical and general Index. By HENRY CAREY, M. A., Worcester College, Oxford. New York. 12mo. pp. 613.

THE ILIAD OF HOMER.—Literally translated with explanatory Notes. By THEODORE ALOIS BUCKLEY, B. A., of Christ Church, Oxford. 12mo. pp. 466.

The attention given of late years by German scholars to the ancient classics, and their unwearied labors in restoring the purity of the original text, have not been lost sight of by the English translators of these standard works. This valuable and neat edition will fill a large gap in a multitude of private libraries.

EDITH HALE. A Village Story. By GRACE TALMON. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856. 12mo, pp. 521.

WOLFSDEN. An authentic account of things there and thereunto pertaining, as they are, and have been. By J. B. Boston: Philips, Sampson & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 504.

RACHEL GRAY. A Tale founded on fact. By JULIA KAVANAGH. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 308.

KATE WESTON; or, To Will and To Do. By JENNIE DE WITT. With eight Illustrations. New York: De Witt & Davenport. 1856. 12mo. pp. 456.

GEOFFREY MONCTON; or, The Faithless Guardian. By SUSANNA MOODIE. New York: De Witt & Davenport. 1856. 12mo. pp. 362.

PARISIAN SIGHTS AND FRENCH PRINCIPLES, seen through American spectacles. By JAMES JACKSON JARVES. Second series. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. 277. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

One in reading this volume almost imagines himself in Paris, alternately amused and provoked, laughing at, and condemning the strange queer contrasts which human life there perpetually presents. Mr. Jarves' Second Series is a decided improvement upon his first. His "Art Hints" showed him to be a scholar of exquisite taste; and in the present volume as well as in that, while describing or commenting upon the extremest contrasts of social life he never forgets his own noble heritage of American citizenship. In this respect, especially, the tone of his volume will be healthful; when there is so strong a tendency in this country in what are termed the upper classes, and among both sexes, to pay homage to the broken down *roués* of a foreign aristocracy. He has given us an amusing book; tragedy and comedy, high life and low life, manners and morals are thrown off from his dashing but graceful pen. Paris itself passes before us like a moving panorama, and the writer is led by association to repeat some of the most stirring passages of modern French history. Dr. Johnson, who hated the French even more than he did the Scotch, used to rave and storm at those French peculiarities which only provoke our mirth. Who-

ever wishes to philosophize or moralize over the modern history of France, will find abundant materials in this entertaining volume.

THE HISTORY OF HERNANDO CORTEZ. By J. S. C. ABBOTT. With engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 18mo. pp. 348. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Great responsibility rests upon Mr. Abbott in preparing these beautiful volumes for the youth of our country, and which are sure to be read by multitudes. In this history of the "Conquest of Mexico," he has substantially followed the Spanish authorities, in which we are more and more certain that there is an intimate blending of fact and fiction.

HARPERS' STORY BOOKS—No. 15, American History. No. 16, John True.

Each Number of these attractive Story Books contains one hundred and sixty pages in quarto form, beautifully and profusely illustrated, and handsomely printed.

FLAMBO: A Brief Treatise on the Persecuting and Dangerous Character of Popery. By a Presbyter of the Diocese of New York. New York: Pudney & Russell. 1855. 12mo. pp. 80.

We fully agree with the author as to the "persecuting and dangerous character of Popery." The mass of facts which he arrays are sufficient to establish this point beyond dispute. And yet there are, and have been for hundreds of years, two kinds of Popery; the ultra-Montane, or Italian School, now in the ascendant; and the Gallican School, or the moderate party, which regards the Pope as supreme in spiritual matters only. These moderate views are advocated by that party in this country with great boldness. Hence, we cannot join the writer in an exterminating war against Romanists; nor can we class them indiscriminately with "Camanches" and "Bedouins." We know there are ultraists among the Romanists, even here; men who would force the alternative upon us of submission, or war to the death. But they are simply mad men, and must be treated as such. We would grant to the Romanists the freest toleration in their religion; and yet we would assure ourselves, if need be, that they disown the Pope's supremacy in all temporal matters.

ADDRESSES DELIVERED IN NEW YORK. By Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, A. M. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author. Also, the Address of the Rev. Dr. ADAMS at the Broadway Tabernacle. Edited by W. P. STRICKLAND, D. D. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1856. 12mo. pp. 151.

This Mr. Arthur is an Irishman and a Methodist, who came to this country to raise money to carry on Methodist Missions in Ireland, in furthering which object he appears to have been entirely successful.

LOVE THE MOTIVE POWER in the Christian Nurture of Children. In two Dialogues. 18mo. pp. 127.

SKETCHES OF DINGLE PARISH. By a Presbyter of Western New York. 18mo. pp. 142.

LITTLE DORA; or the Lord's Day a Sign. By the Rev. HENRY C. LAY. 18mo. pp. 63.

WILLIE AND ROBERT. A Narrative of the pious lives and early deaths of two Christian children. 18mo. pp. 47.

These four volumes have just been issued by the Sunday School Union and Church Book Society; they are attractively written, are earnest and loyal in their Christian tone, and are valuable additions to the juvenile literature of the Church. "Little Dora" presents those views of the Christian Sabbath, which, in our violent revulsion from Puritan sternness, we are apt to lose sight of.

Sophia Kennedy's Experience; or the Stepmother. By Lucy Ellen Guernsey. New York: G. P. E. S. S. Union. 1856. 18mo. pp. 244.

While this well-written story illustrates the character of a most excellent Stepmother, it also shows what is meant by Christian Nurture in its truest sense. It is a good book, and the Church Book Society cannot multiply such volumes to too great an extent.

The History of the United States, from the Earliest period to the present time. By J. A. Spencer, D. D. Splendidly illustrated with original Portraits and Historical Scenes. New York: Martin & Johnson.

This work is to be published in royal quarto, in Parts of about 24 pages, each to contain an Engraving on steel. The specimens before us are published in a very high style of artistic beauty. That Dr. Spencer will do his work neatly and well, we do not doubt. We hope he will have the courage to tell the truth both of the New England and the Maryland Colonies.

A Programme of Themes and Texts for the Sundays, Festivals, and Fasts of the Ecclesiastical Year. By N. W. Camp, D. D., Rector-Elect of the Holy Trinity, City of Hudson, N. J. New York: Dana & Co. 1855. pp. 48.

The importance of bringing the teaching of the pulpit into the strictest harmony with that of the Church, in her various seasons, as she goes through year by year with the wonderful story of Redemption, first suggested to the author the preparation of this well arranged Manual. We think the Clergy may, if they will, find it very suggestive and useful.

La Santa Chiesa Cattolica dagli Scritti degli Arcivescovi Ussher e Bramhall, dei Vescovi Taylor, Ferne, Cosin, Pearson, Bull, e dei Dottori Hooker, e Jackson. Estratto di Frederico Meryick, A. M., Socio del Coll. SS. Trinità in Oxford. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1855.

We are happy to invite attention to another of the publications of the "Association for making known on the Continent the Principles of the Anglican Church." We have reason to know that there is even now a new spirit of enquiry aroused even in the heart of Italy, among thoughtful men And if we have any confidence in the power of truth, we must believe that that spirit will deepen, and spread more and more. The selection before us is admirably calculated to guide that spirit in the right direction, and so save the Italian mind from that abyss of infidelity which is the almost natural reaction from Papal superstition, error and tyranny. The Association is doing a great and good work.

Harpers' Story Books, No. 15. The Story of American History from the earliest settlement of the Country to the establishment of the Federal Constitution. By Jacob Abbott. 4to. pp. 160. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

To familiarize the children of our country with the leading facts, events and persons of our early national history, and to cherish in their hearts a spirit of intelligent and lofty patriotism, is the evident design, and will be the tendency, we think, of this beautiful story by Mr. Jacob Abbott.

The Little Learner. Learning to Think. Consisting of early and entertaining Lessons, designed to assist in the first unfolding of the reflective and reasoning powers of children. By Jacob Abbott. Illustrated with one hundred and twenty Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 4to. pp. 192. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Such a collection of beautiful pictures would, in our boyish days, have caused a sensation. These pictures Mr. Abbott makes the subject of a multitude of questions calculated to set children to thinking; and this is the object of the volume. It is a nice present for the little folks.

SPIRIT OF MISSIONS, February, 1856. New York: Dana & Co.

This Monthly Missionary Magazine, edited by the Secretaries and General Agents of the Foreign and Domestic Committees, has become a most important and valuable work. The No. before us contains a mass of information from Africa, South America, California, and China, some of which is of great interest to the scholar, as well as to the Christian. As a powerful auxiliary to the Missionary cause, this periodical ought to be circulated freely in every parish throughout the Church. And yet, we have facts before us, from reliable sources, which show the most utter indifference, to say the least that can be said, to the circulation of the "Spirit of Missions," and that, too, in quarters where such a feeling has not been generally supposed to exist. The spirit of party seems to be stronger than "THE SPIRIT OF MISSIONS." We do not believe this feeling to be very prevalent. For sure we are that true Christians among us not only *must*, but *will*, rally alike around the Foreign and Domestic Missionary work of the Church at the present day. The Great Head of the Church is giving to that work, at home and abroad, most unmistakable tokens of His presence and blessing. But we cannot withhold the expression of regret that so large a portion of funds for Domestic Missions is still withheld from the Domestic Board, especially when the spirit of conciliation has so largely prevailed in the construction of that Board. More faith, more love, more humility, more charity, more of the spirit of Christ, and our Missions will assume a new appearance. The Methodists, the Presbyterians, and the Romanists, in their Missionary movements, exhibit no such folly "of a house divided against itself."

FORTY YEARS IN TRINITY PARISH. Rev. Dr. HARRY CROSWELL'S Pastoral Letter: With a Sermon in Trinity Church, New Haven, Dec. 31, 1854. New Haven: T. J. Stafford. 1856. 8vo. pp. 15.

The growth of the Church in New Haven, has been more remarkable, we suppose, than in any other town or city in the country. When the venerable Doctor Croswell took charge of Trinity Parish, in 1815, it consisted of about *one hundred and thirty* families. Since then, "parishes have been organized, and Churches erected, viz:—In Westville and Fair Haven—and in the compact limits of the city, St. Thomas'; and two free churches, (St. Paul's Mission, and Christ Church,) besides St. Luke's, composed of colored members of the Episcopal Church:—making eight Church edifices—and all within the limits formerly occupied alone by Trinity Church. And yet, with all these changes, this parish still retains a stable congregation of about five hundred families—an evidence of the expansion of the Church, we venture to say, without a parallel, in the older settlements of our country."

For the first thirty-three years, reaching to the time when the congregations were separated, we find recorded—Baptisms, 2439—Marriages, 743—Burials, 1786.

During the seven years since that period—Baptisms, 279—Marriages, 167—Burials, 304.

Making in the aggregate—2718 Baptisms—910 Marriages—and 2090 Burials.

This Parish has often been appealed to in proof of the benefit to the Church of a permanent Rectorate; it having had but two Rectors before the present incumbent. But there are exceptions to this rule. Many a parish has been benefitted by a change of Rectors, and a long continuance of some incumbents would be the death of almost any parish.

THE WORK OF THE CHURCH IN AMERICA, ESPECIALLY IN THE WEST. An Address delivered before the Society of Enquiry, in Marietta College, Ohio, July 28th, 1855. By the Rev. WILLIAM W. ANDREWS. New York: J. Moffet. 1856. 8vo. pp. 24.

Mr. Andrews is the ablest and leading representative in this country of the new sect now known as "Irvingites," though they disown the name. He was a

gregationalist by birth and by profession, and for many years was a preach-
n that sect. Some of his earlier and transition writings led us to predict
him a life of great usefulness in what we believed to be the Church of
ist. For we knew him to be a man of rare promise, with a mind enriched
ripe culture, and a soul attuned to the deeper harmonies of our spiritual
ig. But, instead of finally anchoring on the true basis of Catholic Faith
Order, instead of trusting in Christ's own Institutions and promises,
ided by His predictions of the very distractions which we now witness and
rn, Mr. Andrews must needs "guess out" a new remedy for Christendom,
what he calls a restored Apostolate. His Address before us, though it con-
s nothing new, yet we presume it startled its auditors by its vigorous expo-
on and denunciation of the sin and the evils of Sectism, and its assertion of
necessity of a Visible Unity. As for ourselves, we are sad that one so rich
ifts should waste his life in such miserable trifling, and, alas! in what is
se than trifling. This Address shows more of the leaven of a rampant indi-
alism than we expected to see in him. His own theory is not broached
t.

LUSIVENESS: Lecture for Christmas Eve, delivered on Monday, Dec. 24, 1855.
y the Rev. Dr. T. W. Coit, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Troy, New York.
ith Notes. Troy: W. H. Young. 1856. 8vo. pp. 72.

We must say that we are very much obliged to the Presbyterian Dr. Beman,
pouncing on this Christmas-Eve Sermon of the Rev. Dr. Coit. For although
latter gentleman we have heard of as settling down again into a Parish
st, doing a great work and doing it well, yet he possesses rare gifts and tal-
s which might slumber undisturbed in the ordinary routine of parochial life.
Sermon was designed to prove that the charge of "*Exclusiveness*," so often
ught against the Church, is simply *impertinent*. And this point he presents
h great clearness and force. He also enlarges upon the forgotten truism,
t "Charity" has to do with the heart and not the head, with the feelings
not the creed, motives and not sentiments or opinions. He then shows
t the tone or temper of the Church is eminently and distinctively liberal
charitable. Now it seems that Dr. Beman, on seeing an imperfect news-
er report of this Sermon, was suddenly smitten with that dangerous infec-
n, the *cacoethes scribendi*, and he could not rest till he had delivered himself
twelve newspaper articles: yet containing nothing new, nothing that has
been much better said, and in much better temper, a hundred times before.
ppears to us, that if Dr. Beman felt that he *must write* about something, he
ht have at least attempted to clear his own reputation from the grave
rge publicly brought against himself by the Presbyterians, ("the Presbyte-
n Board of Publication,") in which they say, among other things equally
thy of his consideration, that his "*view of the Atonement no man can be
and be a Christian.*" (See "Publications," No. 167, p. 95.) At any rate,
ertainly committed a great blunder in this attack upon Dr. Coit. The latter
simply published his Sermon, enriching it with copious Notes. His Note,
on "Schism," presents in a masterly manner the only possible basis of
ATHOLIC UNION," one which such men as Bishop Griswold have practically
gnized; and which we wish our Clergy, and especially our Theological
dents, would carefully study. Averse as we ought to be to controversy, for
mere sake of controversy, yet in such an age of doctrinal laxity as the
ent, we are religiously bound to "contend earnestly for the Faith once
vered to the Saints." In this contest, the Rev. Dr. Coit's pamphlet is a
t valuable auxiliary. If he has used the scalpel effectually he has done it
efully, and men who love the Church will thank him for the operation.

ort of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. 1855.
ceedings of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East. 1855.
yer Book and Homily Society. 1855.

Report of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1855.

Church of England Education Society. 1855.

For the above Reports we are indebted again to the kindness of the Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, of London.

An abstract of the Reports appears under the head of Foreign Intelligence.

A Charge, delivered at a Visitation of the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Archdeaconry of York, held at Toronto, on Tuesday, Sept. 4; at Hamilton, on Wednesday, Sept. 5, and at London, on Thursday, Sept. 6, 1855. By the Venerable A. N. Bethune, D. D., Archdeacon of York. 1855.

The American Journal of Science and Arts. Conducted by Profs. B. Silliman and B. Silliman, Jr., and James D. Dana, aided, &c. New Haven, Conn. January and March, 1856.

We again ask attention to this invaluable publication. The Numbers, though mostly and strictly Scientific, contain many contributions attractive to the general reader, and a condensed view of the progress of Science and the Arts in all parts of the world. The Conductors are thorough scholars, enthusiastically devoted to their profession.

Littell's Living Age.

This is a weekly Repository of Literature, mostly reprinted from Foreign Magazines; and contains many of the choicest productions of the best writers of the day. The selections embrace all schools of Theology and Politics; and the reader may keep pretty well "posted up" in English and Continental matters.

Register of the College of St. James, Maryland. 1856.

Register of St. Mary's Hall. Burlington, N. J. 1856.

The Pennsylvania Journal of Prison Discipline. January, 1856. Philadelphia.

A most valuable publication, and worthy of the attention of philanthropists.

Bishop Doane's Lenten Offering. 1856.

Facts against Fancy; or a True and Just View of Trinity Church, New York City. 1855. 8vo. pp. 74.

We think the Vestry of Trinity Church have erred, greatly erred, in expending such large sums in the erection of costly edifices, when the same amount of funds would have erected a large number of humbler yet equally capacious Churches in positions where they are imperiously needed. This conviction, we also think, is much deeper and more widely felt than some of the best friends of Trinity suppose. And yet whatever may have been the sins of omission of Trinity Church, it appears by this pamphlet of the Rev. Dr. Berrian, that in its gifts, loans, and grants, considerably exceed *two millions* of dollars; and that some of the loudest of the remonstrances at her niggardliness and stinginess come from those who have feasted most plenteously at her crib.

Trinity Church Case. Dr. Tyng and others against Trinity Church. By a Presbyter. 1856.

Rev. T. S. Arthur's Remarks in the South Carolina Convention in Feb. 1854, on the "Itinerant System."

This is the true System to do a certain kind and degree of work; and we only wonder that the Church, in her Domestic Missionary field, does not adopt it to a much greater extent.

Confirmation: or Tracts for the Use of Persons about to be Confirmed. Selected from Tracts for Parochial Use. Robinson, Baltimore.

Third Pastoral Report of the Rector of Trinity Church, Pottsville, Penn. 1855.

OF SCRIPTURE to the teaching of the Church on Holy Baptism, with reference to the case of Infants, and answers to Objections. Fifth s, from the Third London Edition. New York: Dana & Co. 1856.

he old Tract "Sacrament of Responsibility," with a new title. We ave studied this subject sufficiently to know how difficult it is to ecularly of the nature of Infant Baptism in a manner to suit even all loyal Churchmen. We think we know, also, what it is in this Tract ected to. And yet we know, also, of persons belonging to what calls 'Evangelical School," who have given to this Tract unqualified com-

TIAN LIFE: The Rev. J. H. Morrison's Sermon in St. Peter's Church, re, Sept. 30th, 1855.

F SCRIPTURE CONTRASTED WITH LYING WONDERS: Rev. J. H. Morrison's in St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, Feb. 10th, 1856.

se are excellent pastoral Sermons, sound, sensible, and pertinent to

letter from the Rector, (Rev. Charles Aldis,) to the Congregation of hurch, Detroit, Mich. 1856.

F HOBART FREE COLLEGE, at Geneva, New York. For the Academical 55–56.

portant College, under the Presidency of the REV. BENJAMIN HALE, r numbers Twelve Professors, and *ninety-seven* Students; viz. *fifteen* lical Department; *sixteen* Seniors; *twenty five* Juniors; *twenty-seven* n; and *fourteen* Freshmen. The College buildings are pleasantly d the course of study is well arranged.

OF THE STUDENTS OF THE NASHOTAH SEMINARY, 1855–6.

h Seminary is situated in a retired and healthful location in Wiscon- miles west of Milwaukee, easy of access, and now contains *thirty-* g men preparing for the Ministry.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Hilliard, F. W.	Atkinson,	Dec. 2, 1855,	Christ Church, Raleigh, N. C.
LaFourette, J. A. M.	Potter, H.	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. Paul's Chapel, N. Y.
Macdonald, David F.	Kip,	Dec. 22, 1855,	Trinity Church, San Fran., Cal.
Menaos, Anastasius,	Cobbs,	Jan. 2, 1856,	St. John's, Montgomery, Al.
Mitchell, W. A.	Doane,	Mar. 16,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Seaman, Samuel B.	Lee, A.	Feb. 13, 1856,	St. Stephen's, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRIESTS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Barnard, F. A. P.	Green,	Dec. 23, 1855,	———, Oxford, Miss.
Bush, James S.	Doane,	Jan. 20, 1856,	St. Mark's, Orange, N. J.
Chetwood, Hobart,	Doane,	Mar. 16, 1856,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Conell, J. T. D.	Potter, H.	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. Paul's Chapel, N. Y.
Crooke, G. A.	Potter, A.	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Doane, Wm. Croswell,	Doane,	Mar. 16, 1856,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Edmunds, Charles C.	Kemper,	Dec. 16, 1855,	Christ Church, Green Bay, W.
Greene, Copley, S. J.	Eastburn,	Feb. 24, 1856,	Christ Church, Waltham, Mass.
Holly, J. T. D. (African)	Williams,	Jan. 3, 1856,	St. Luke's, (African,) N. Haven,
Hutcheson, J. T.	Whittingham,	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. Peters', Ellicotts Mills, Md.
Jarvis, S. F.	Williams,	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. John's, Millville, Mass.
Mayers, J. S.	Doane,	Mar. 16, 1856,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Oliver, R. W.	Potter, A.	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Peirce, Joshua R.	Chase,	Jan. 23, 1856,	Trinity, Holderness, N. H.
Quintard, Charles T.	Otey,	Jan. 6, 1856,	Calvary, Memphis, Tenn.
Ray, William P.	Potter, A.	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Robins, J. W.	Potter, A.	Dec. 23, 1855,	St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Russell, Francis T.	Williams,	Mar. 12, 1856,	St. Mark's, New Britain, Conn.
Staudenmayer, L. R.	Cobbs,	Feb. 6, 1856,	St. Luke's, Jacksonville, Ala.
Webb, H. H., (African,)	Whittingham,	Jan. 25, 1856,	St. James', First African, Bal.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place*
Calvary,	Green,	Dec. 22, 1855,	Holmes County, Miss.
Chapel of E. Theo. Sem.,	Johns,	Dec. 26, 1855,	Alexandria, Va.
Grace,	Smith,	Jan. 10, 1856,	Louisville, Ky.
Grace,	Lee, H.	Feb. 17, 1856,	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
St. Johns',	Cobbs,	Dec. 9, 1855,	Montgomery, Ala.
Trinity,	Kemper,	Oct. 29, 1855,	St. Albans, Minnesota.
Trinity,	Williams,	Jan. 31, 1856,	Southport, Conn.

OBITUARY.

Joshua Bradley died at St. Paul's, Minnesota, November 22d, aged 84
a native of Randolph, Mass., where he served apprenticeship as a shoe-
Was afterwards graduated honorably at Brown University, working
through poverty and hardships.

Edward C. Babcock, Missionary at Greenpoint, L. I., died in New York,
ber 30th, aged 27.

Zadock Thompson died at Burlington, Vermont, on Saturday, January
Mr. Thompson was one of those few cases, whose deep and unconquer-
desty of spirit prevented his ever rising above the Diaconate in the
. The uncertainty of his health for many years past prevented his un-
ng the labors of the Parish. His gentle, quiet and deep piety of char-
on him universal esteem. He was chiefly known by the many works
ch he has embodied the History, Topography and Natural endowments
ative State. In Natural Science his proficiency was so remarkable that
in correspondence with most of the leading Naturalists of this country,
ny of those abroad. He received one of the medals at the late French
ion in this department. His place thus left vacant in Vermont will be
fill.

—At Bassa Cove, Buchanan City, West Africa, on the 10th of Novem-
, of a severe attack of bilious fever, Mary Louisa, wife of Rev. Jacob
, of the Prot. Episcopal Mission at that place, in her 28th year. Mrs.
had been connected with the Mission about two years, and had most
ly devoted herself to her duties, greatly endearing herself to the little
Missionaries with whom she was associated. She died lamented by
has left a large circle of friends in this country, who were warmly
d to her, for her gentle, lovely disposition, and amiable Christian char-
Truly for her "To live was Christ, and to die was gain." Having for-
ll for Christ, she labored in faith and hope for a short time for the good
a's children, and having fallen calmly asleep in Jesus, she now rests
r labors.

—On the 4th of January, at his late residence, in the town of Green Oak,
ton county, Michigan, the Rev. A. S. Hollister, Rector of St. Stephen's
, Hamburgh, in the 60th year of his age.
Hollister was ordained deacon (in the absence of Bishop Hobart) by
Croes, at New Brunswick, on the 25th of November, 1821. He com-
. his ministerial labors at Trenton, Oneida county, New York, and during
d of fourteen years was subsequently at Paris Hill, Skaneateles and
a. In 1885 he came to Michigan, and settled at Troy, Oakland county,
anized a parish at Troy, one at Pontiac, and one at Waterford. In 1843
ed to Livingston county, purchased a small farm, and organized a parish
burgh, of which he was Rector, (except about a year and a half, and
one year of which he was Chaplain to the State Prison.)
Hollister was a good theologian, a sound Churchman, and a very accept-
eacher, a kind friend and neighbor, and died in charity with all men,
trust so used the talents committed to his care that he has received the
e of well done, good and faithful servant.

NEW YORK.

CHURCH COLLEGE AND HOME FOR THE SONS OF THE CLERGY.

bject of this College is to supply the Diocese of New York specially,
Church generally, with a free College for the education and support of
s of the Clergy, more especially those of Missionaries, whether at home

or abroad, left orphan and destitute. It is proposed to organize and found such an Institution at Irvington, Westchester County, New York, where there already exists an endowed Chapel School, with similar though minor objects of charity, known as the "CHAPEL SCHOOL OF ST. BARNABAS."

The Chapel School to be merged in the new and higher organization of the College, transferring to it its name, grounds, Chapel School buildings and village property, so as to be henceforth designated as the "College of St. Barnabas"—a name, (it may be added,) peculiarly appropriate to such a charity, as being that of the "Son of Consolation," recorded in Scripture.

The Board of Trustees is to consist of eight—five of them *ex-officio*:—The acting Bishop of the Diocese in which it is situated, as its *ex-officio* Visitor. Present Trustees of the Chapel School: The Rector of the Parish and Chapel School at Irvington. The Rector of Trinity Church, New York. Subject to the approval of the Board of Missions, the Secretary and General Agent of the Domestic Missionary Committee, the Secretary and General Agent of the Foreign Missionary Committee, together with the following individual Trustees, viz, John Jay, Esq., and D. D. Foote, Esq., of Greenburgh, the Founder of its landed endowment with right of naming by will his successor in that trust. It may also be added that the Rev. Dr. McVickar has endowed St. Barnabas College in land and money to the amount of more than $32,000.

OUR MISSIONS IN AFRICA.

The African Mission has of late assumed new interest and importance, and the following sketch of its history and present condition, mostly from the pen of Bishop Payne, is worthy of preservation.

The operations of the Protestant Episcopal Mission, it is generally known, have been directed to Colonists and Natives.

THE COLONISTS.

When the writer assumed the pastoral care of the Colonist congregation at Cape Palmas, in 1847, there were on the list *nine communicants*. From that time, until the close of the last year, there had died, removed or been suspended, *twenty*. Notwithstanding this, at the beginning of the present year, there were over *fifty* Colonist communicants connected with the Church.

Only within the last two years the operations of the Church have been extended to Monrovia. During this time about *fifty* communicants have been gathered in the two Churches, Trinity, Monrovia, and Grace Church, Clay-Ashland, in Mesurado county, making an aggregate of at least *one hundred Colonist communicants*.

COLONIST CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS.

St. Mark's, Cape Palmas, a fine stone building, has long since been completed, and in use, as has also Grace Church, at Clay-Ashland. Trinity Church, at Monrovia, a stone structure, 55 feet by 75 feet, is also in course of erection.

The Orphan Asylum, on the extremity of Cape Palmas, is at once an ornament and a blessing to the infant Colony; as is also the *High School*, three miles distant, at Mt. Vaughan. Connected with these institutions, are *twenty-seven* boarding scholars; while there are at present, or will shortly be, connected with them and the Female Day School at Mt. Vaughan, about *one hundred day scholars*. In these Sunday-Schools the number is somewhat greater.

At *Monrovia*, and in Mesurado county, are four Episcopal Day Schools—one of a high grade, under the Rev. Alexander Crummell, assisted by Mrs. Williams; and the former has two young men under his care with a view to the ministry.

In the Sunday-schools here, are about *sixty* children.

Besides the above-named young men at Monrovia, two members of the High

ave expressed their conviction of duty, and earnest desire to enter the

are, then, in all, *four Colonist* candidates for the *ministry*.

THE NATIVES.

erations of the Mission have always been chiefly directed to natives. ns employed have been boarding-schools, day and night schools, visit- house to house, and public preaching of the Gospel.
arding-schools have been, hitherto, apparently most productive of results.
ly fewer than *fifteen hundred* heathen children and youth have been d with these schools during the existence of the Mission, for longer ter periods.
these, *ninety-one* have been baptized and received into the Communion Church—of whom *thirty-one* have died or been suspended, leaving so, at present, on the communicants' list. And these communicants ve furnished *two native deacons, thirteen school-masters*, employed at times. Connected with the night-schools at different times and periods, there have been *several hundreds* of natives of nearly all ages. ionaries say that "God is now pouring out His Spirit upon this peo- *ver before.* Since the 8th of April, 84 heathen converts have been , 24 of whom were from native towns. In the Cavalla towns, where ll these people reside, there are still many hopeful inquiries. A large on of the inhabitants have renounced *gree grees*, and only need the in- of the Spirit to enable them to give up all for Christ. At this very Bishop is prevented from visiting Bassa Cove, Monrovia, and other arts of the Mission, for want of assistance at Cavalla. One more re- sionary is also needed at Taboo—one at Fishtown, and another at mas. While it is absolutely requisite to have four more, in order to the work effectually, a *dozen* might be usefully employed at these dif- ations. It is utterly impossible for the Missionaries now on the o do one half the work pressing on them continually."

PROTESTANT CHURCHMAN" AND BISHOP SEABURY, AND THE LAITY.

No. of the "*Protestant Churchman*," unintentionally we hope, ned its readers as to the views of Bishop Seabury on the admission on to seats in the Convention. A writer, who, as we understand, is stant Bishop of Connecticut, sent to that paper the following com- on, which deserves to be preserved for future reference:

ement is made in a late number of the Protestant Churchman as to the Bishop Seabury on the admission of laymen to seats in Conventions, nless it is explained by the facts and circumstances of the case, can il to convey erroneous impressions. Indeed, the assertion has often qualifiedly made that Bishop Seabury strenuously opposed the admis- e laity.
s opposition is very readily explained, and, when explained, involves view on his part as has generally been supposed. The present writer explanation he is about to give from the second Bishop of Connec- ough his son. It came originally from Bishop Seabury himself.
a very prevalent idea, after the Revolution had rendered it neces- eadjust our ecclesiastical framework, that the Conventions should ex- t only *legislative* but also *judicial* functions. This being so, the ad- f the laity to these bodies would necessarily involve their sitting as cases ecclesiastical on the clergy, and sharing in the administration ine. And while Bishop Seabury had no sympathy with the Romish

idea of freeing Clergymen from their amenability to lay judges in the Courts of the land, he had no sympathy either, with the idea of subjecting them to lay judges in trials ecclesiastical. In his view, the doing so would violate two principles: first the principle that discipline of spirituals, as well as preaching the Word and ministering the Sacraments, was committed to the Christian Ministry; and secondly, the principle that every man has a right to be tried by his peers. His opposition, then, to admitting the laity to seats in Convention, grew out of no unwillingness that they should share in the legislative action of the Church, but only in its judicial. And when the right view prevailed, and legislation only was committed to Conventions, and discipline in *fact* was relegated to its proper administrators, then his opposition to the admission of the laity was at an end; while the separation of functions, which he advocated, and on which his alleged opposition to the laity was grounded, has become alike the usage and the law of the Church.

The correctness of this statement of the views of Bishop Seabury is placed beyond the possibility of a doubt by the documentary history of a singular case in the Diocese of Connecticut. After the present Prayer Book was set forth by our "Bishops, Clergy, and Laity," in 1789, the Rev. James Sayre, of Stratford, violently opposed it, and refused to use it; this being the only instance of such a refusal in the Diocese. His opposition and refusal were by himself placed chiefly on the ground that there were laymen in the Convention which set forth the Book. The Rev. Dr. Bowden wrote, and, with the approval of Bishop Seabury, published, an address to the members of Mr. Sayre's parish; and this address, while it makes the distinction above noted between legislation and discipline, contains a long and elaborate vindication of the right of the laity to share in ecclesiastical legislation, as consonant with reason, Revelation, and the usage alike of the ancient and the mother Church.

Moreover, Mr. Sayre had accused Bishop Seabury of inconsistency, in that, having objected in his charge, delivered at Derby in 1786, against the "*Proposed Book*," set forth in 1785 by a Convention composed of presbyters and laymen, he was now faulting him for objecting to one set forth by another similarly constituted Convention in 1789. To this, Dr. Bowden, in a letter to Mr. Sayre, printed with the address above mentioned, replies, that the Conventions of 1785 and 1789 were not similarly constituted. For that, while in 1785 there was not a single Bishop in the Convention, in 1789 Bishops were present; and that this fact, in Bishop Seabury's view, constituted the essential difference between them.

Indeed, a bare inspection of the charge (which, as well as the other pamphlet mentioned, is now before the writer) shows that it was not the *presence* of laymen, but the *absence* of Bishops that Bishop Seabury alleged against the Convention of 1785 as connected with the Proposed Book. He says that for presbyters and laymen alone to set forth a Liturgy for the Church, without the presence and concurrence of the Episcopate, is to make the Church "Episcopal in orders, but Presbyterian in government." It is not intended to assert that Bishop Seabury had no fault to find with the Proposed Book itself, but that *quoad* the authority of the Convention setting it forth, his objection was not grounded on the presence of laymen in it.

These facts, it is believed, explain the position of Bishop Seabury in reference to the laity. While it ought not to be forgotten that one of the earliest, if not the very earliest vindication of the rights of the laity to the exercise of those legislative functions which they now enjoy in our Church, was undertaken at his instance and published with his sanction

CONGREGATIONALISM IN CONNECTICUT.

It appears that the "Saybrook Platform," notwithstanding the tinkering done to it two years ago at New London, does not hold together well. It is rickety and people dare not trust it. We find a curious fact in the papers of the day in connection with the rival and opposition East Windsor and Yale Theolog-

L SEMINARIES, as both Schools are apparently very thinly attended, there has en proposed a "plan of union" of the two Seminaries. The proposition me from the friends of East Windsor, and is substantially this: that the two minaries be united in the institution at New Haven; that the funds of East indsor be used to endow certain professorships; and that the professors on ese foundations be *nominated* by the Pastoral Union (East Windsor) and *ted* by the Corporation of Yale College. The matter was debated at New aven in February last, at great length, and the discussion ended where it gan. So East Windsor keeps its money, and New Haven keeps the staff at w Haven in its own hands. The real fact, neither of these parties seem to scern. Congregationalism has lost its vitality. A few noisy, conceited *charl-ans*, like Henry Ward Beecher, are trying to galvanize it into life. But as a stem of religion, strictly so called, as a system of Faith in the revealed mys-ries of Christ, it is well-nigh dead, and has become instead, a system of brawl-g, bigoted, *pseudo-humanitarianism*.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

The Bishop of Carlisle died suddenly at his seat, Rose Castle, near Carlisle, Tuesday afternoon, February 12th. The Right Rev. Prelate had been ailing r a day or two, but no serious result had been apprehended by his medical tendant or his family. The deceased prelate, the Hon. and Right Rev. Hugh ney, D. D., was the fifty-fifth Bishop of Carlisle, third son of the first and rother to the second Earl of Beverly. Dr. Percy was born in London on the th of January, 1784, so that he had just completed his seventy-second year. le was twice married; first, in May, 1806, to Mary, eldest daughter of the lest Rev. Charles Manners Sutton, Archbishop of Canterbury; she died in ptember, 1831. Secondly, in February, 1840, to Mary, second daughter of he late Vice-Admiral Sir Wm. Johnstone Hope; she died in 1851. The late relate was consecrated Bishop of Rochester in June, 1827, and was translated the See of Carlisle in the following September; so that he has presided over the ter diocese more than twenty-eight years. He was also Chancellor of Salis-ry, and Prebendary of St. Paul's, (appointed in 1816,) and was patron of forty-ve livings. By his first marriage he had eleven children.

NEW APPOINTMENTS OF ENGLISH BISHOPS.

In place of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Percy, the new Bishop of Carlisle is the Hon. nd Rev. Montague Villiers. He is a younger son of the late Earl of Clarendon, nd brother of Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. le was educated at Christ's Church, Oxford, where in 1834 he took his degree f B. A., but he does not appear to have taken honors of any kind either in assics or mathematics. In 1841, being then twenty-nine years of age, he was ppointed by the Lord Chancellor to the rectory of St. George's, Bloomsbury, orth £800 a year; and in 1847 by Lord John Russell to a canonry residen-ary in St. Paul's Cathedral, worth £1,000 a year; but these will become vacant n his consecration to the Episcopate—the rectory of Bloomsbury being in the ft of Lord Cranworth, and the canonry of St. Paul's in the gift of Lord Pal-erston. Mr. Villiers has been for many years past one of the leaders of the called Evangelical party in the Church, but has never interfered in politics.

Her Majesty has been pleased to appoint the Ven. Reginald Courtenay, Archdeacon of Middlesex, in Jamaica, to be coadjutor to the Bishop of Jamaica, under the name and style of Bishop of Kingston. Bishop Spencer retires from active service on a pension.

CONSECRATION OF ANOTHER COLONIAL BISHOP.

The Consecration of the Rev. Dr. M'Dougall as Bishop of Labuan, took place at Calcutta on St. Luke's Day, October 18. Labuan is a small island off Borneo. This consecration is attended with great and memorable interest for the minds of Churchmen, inasmuch as it is the first consecration of an English Colonial Bishop which has been performed out of England. The chief officiating Prelate was the Bishop of Calcutta, acting as metropolitan under commission from the Archbishop of Canterbury. He was assisted by the Bishops of Madras and Victoria. The greatest interest was excited on the occasion, and the Cathedral was crowded to excess, while hundreds sought admission in vain. The new Bishop preached on the following Sunday for his mission, and received from one gentleman alone a contribution of 1000 Calcutta rupees. Mr. M'Dougall came to England to obtain consecration, but the State-fettered Church could not commission him because Sarawak was not out of her Majesty's dominions! while the *Times* sneered at the proposition. But the venerable Wilson has had the courage and grace to found a line of Missionary Bishops. May the succession never be broken. The *Colonial Church Chronicle* for January has a stirring Article on the subject, written in the best spirit.

ANOTHER COLONIAL DIOCESE.—Western Australia has been erected by the Queen into a new Diocese by the name of Perth; and the Ven. Matthew B. Hale, Archdeacon of Adelaide, has been nominated the first Bishop.

MISSIONS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

We are again indebted to the Rev. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, B. D., of London for the last Annual Reports of the Missionary Societies of the English Church, from which we gather the following information.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

The society is now in the 155th year of its useful existence. The religious observances were celebrated on Thursday, June 21st, at St. Paul's Cathedral. There were present the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, Hereford, St. Asaph, and Meath, and a numerous and devout congregation. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Hereford, from Rev. vii, 9, 10. A collection was made at the conclusion of the service in aid of the funds of the society. The chief officers of the society dined with the Lord Mayor in the evening.

One Friday, June 22d, the City of London Committee and the friends of the association held a meeting in the Egyptian-hall, Mansion-House, the Lord Mayor in the chair. On the platform were "The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of St. David's, the Bishop of Landaff, the Bishop of Lincoln, the Bishop of Hereford, the Bishop of St. Asaph, the Bishop of Melbourne, the Dean of St. Paul's, Archdeacon Hale, Canon Champneys, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, (the Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England,) Mr. Thompson Hankey, M. P., Mr. Cazenove, Mr. J. D. Powles, and a great many clergymen."

The body of the Hall was completely filled, principally with ladies. Prayers having been read by the Rev. Mr. Povah, Resolutions were adopted, and speeches made.

The hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary meeting of the society was held on Monday, June 24th, at Willis's Rooms; his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury

hair. Among the persons on the platform, were the Bishop of Chichester, hop of Colombo, the Earl of Carnarvon, Lord Robert Cecil, M. P., the f St. Paul's, Sir John B. Robinson, Chief Justice of Upper Canada; Mr. Coleridge, Lord John Thynne, Archdeacons Sinclair and Grant, Beresope, Esq., &c. The most reverend prelate opened the business of the an earnest appeal to all who had received the blessed truths of the to aid in spreading God's Word through distant lands. Chief Justice on, of Canada, in seconding a Resolution took a comprehensive view of ition and prospects of the Church in Canada. The labors of this society ved well in the place of our Episcopacy. The Church of England was ng wide, and America was most energetic in the promotion of the mis- cause. He was himself a descendant of one of the missionaries in Canada. In 1791, the year in which he was born, the population of Canada was 10,000, with only one missionary. They are now seeking to the bishopric of Toronto into three dioceses, and holding diocesan . But the aid of this society was required. There were in Upper Canly 170 clergymen to 350 townships, whereas, taking the calculation ng to the population of England, they would require sixty clergymen a township. The hon. gentleman, after entering into further statistical concluded by seconding the resolution, which was carried unanimously. receipts of the Society for the past year amounted to £104,501, or about 5, of which there was appropriated by the donors to special purposes, ; collections under the Queen's letter, £27,710; making together, £51,139. linary income of the Society, available for its general purposes, was e £53,382; adding one-third (£9,237) of the Queen's letter collection, l income was raised to £62,619. The expenditure on the general fund ; for the year was £60,396.

total number of missionaries maintained in whole or in part by the is 461, in addition to 700 divinity students, catechists, schoolmasters ers, making the working forces of the society 1,161 persons. The Report he society to be doing a great and glorious work for the Church of

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT.—The Annual Sermon was preached at St. Church, Fleet street, April 30, 1855, by the Rev. W. B. Mackenzie, from , 6. It was a much more appropriate Sermon than usual on such occa- It was a Missionary Sermon.

ncome of the Society for the year was £107,343 2s. 9d., or about 536,000 —and the expenditure £116,256 10s. 8d., or about 581,000 dollars.

the Report it appears that in the course of the last year two Mission- nd the wives of six, have been removed by death. Fifteen Ordained aries have come home, three of whom returned to their labors within r. Thirteen Missionaries, five having been clergymen at home, and seven have been sent out for the first time. Six Missionaries have returned Missions. In other words, while fourteen have been withdrawn, most only temporarily, from the active force of the Society, twenty-six labor- s entered the field.

een of the Society's candidates have been admitted to Deacon's Orders the past year—ten students from the Institution, Islington, one by the hop of Canterbury, and nine by the Bishop of London; two native ts at Abbeokuta by the Bishop of Sierra Leone; two native catechists Bishop of Bombay; one native catechist and one Lutheran clergyman Bishop of Calcutta; one catechist by the Bishop of New Zealand; and echists by the Bishop of Rupert's Land.

NUMBER OF MISSIONARY LABORERS.

ng the last year the number of Missionary laborers has been diminished

by the two deaths already recorded, and by the withdrawal of six Missionaries who had returned home through the failure of health, and other causes, which will prevent their resuming their Missionary work. At the same time, some new laborers have joined the Society abroad, so that the whole number of Ordained Missionaries and European lay teachers is considerably increased, being,

Abroad—	
Ordained European Missionaries,.....	140
Ordained East Indian and Native Missionaries,.....	29
European Catechists, Teachers, and others,.....	39
European Female Teachers,.....	11
At Home—	
Ordained European Missionaries,.....	20
European Female Teacher,.....	1
Total,.....	240

Comparing this return with last year, there appears an increase of 13 clergymen and of six other laborers; making a total increase of 19 laborers of the classes enumerated in the table. There is also an increase in the number of native teachers employed by the Society.

The following is a general summary of the Missions, May 1, 1855 :.

Stations, 122; Ordained Missionaries—European, English, 109; Foreign, 51; Native and East Indian, 29; total, 189. Lay Teachers, Assistants, &c.—European Catechists, Teachers, &c., 39; European Female Teachers, 12; East Indian and Country-born Catechists and Teachers, 17; Ditto Female Teachers, 5. Native Laborers—Catechists, 150; Catechists and Teachers in New Zealand, 357; Scripture Readers and Christian Visitors, 219; Teachers, 774; Female Teachers, 216; total, 1,716. Total number of Agents, 1,978; Communicants, 17,909; Attendants on Public Worship estimated at 107,000. Baptisms during the year, (in the South-India Mission one half of the year only is included, the returns not having arrived in time)—Adults, 1,217; Children, 2,108; Adults or Children, not specified, 198; total, 3,523.

The progress of Missions in the last forty years is thus stated by Mr. Mackenzie in his Sermon:—At the close of the last European war, twelve Missionaries were all our staff—six for Africa, and six for North and South India. China was not thought of; Ceylon not occupied; Western India untouched; East Africa unknown; the Yoruba country fast bound in misery and iron; New Zealand cannibal; Rupert's Land untrodden by any Christian agent. Now, after forty years, 180 clergymen occupy our 121 stations; catechists 1,700, nearly ten times the number of clergymen; and communicants 18,000, about ten times the number of catechists.

Or, take India alone. Glance at the combined amount of Mission labor there. Twenty-two Societies, European and American, are now at work, employing 400 ordained Missionaries, besides forty-eight ordained natives, and 700 native catechists. Three hundred and thirty Christian congregations are already gathered together, including 18,500 communicants, giving satisfactory evidence that they know the interior power of Christianity; and besides these actual converts, 112,000 more are brought under Christian instruction, and form so far the visible Church in India. Ten translations of the whole Bible, and five other versions of the New Testament, feed these inquiring multitudes with the words of life. Twenty-five printing presses are kept at work, throwing off Christian tracts by thousands, and scattering them among the people. This mighty Missionary apparatus is supported at the cost of £200,000, of which our Church Missionary Society provides one-fourth.

The scale on which this Society is prosecuting its Missions, and the results already secured, may be seen in part in the report of one of its fields, that in Madras and South India. The Mission Establishment is as follows:

Mission Establishment.—28 Ordained European Missionaries; 13 Ordained ast Indian and Native Missionaries; 5 European Catechists and Teachers; European Industrial Agent; 2 European Printers and Agents; 3 European male Teachers; 7 East Indian Catechists and Teachers; 2 East Indian Female eachers; 85 Native Catechists; 143 Native Scripture Readers; 384 Native eachers and Schoolmasters; 133 Native Schoolmistresses; Stations, 22; Communicants, 5020; Seminaries and Schools, 427; Seminarists and Scholars, 11,-90; Attendants on Public Worship, no returns; Natives under Christian instruction—Baptized, 22,077; Unbaptized, 11,587; total, 33,664.

The statistical returns, made up to December 31, 1854, exhibit an encouraging increase in the number of converts. They show an aggregate of 33,231 onverts, being an increase of nearly 800 upon the returns at the close of 853. Out of this number, 22,355 are baptized and registered native Christians; he remaining 10,876 are under instruction with a view to baptism. These hristians are distributed in 531 villages, possessing 390 places of public worship. he number of Communicants is 5147, which is an increase of 382 within the ear. The number of schools is about 400, and the scholars amount to 10,931.

It is an additional encouragement that the Missions of other and kindred rotestant Missionary Societies, chiefly of the Society for the Propagation of he Gospel, and of the London Missionary Society, swell these numbers to ore than 77,000 native Christians in South India, and more than 36,000 hildren under Christian education.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

The Anniversary Sermon was preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, June 7, 1855, y the Lord Bishop of Landaff. The income of this Society for this year was 30,703 4s. 3d, or about $150,000. The total number of Books and Tracts, ssued between April, 1854, and April, 1855, has amounted to Four Millions ad Forty-seven Thousand Three Hundred and Fourteen, namely,

Bibles,	133,254
New Testaments,	72,041
Prayer Books,	344,529
Other Books and Tracts,	3,497,490
	4,047,314

The sale of Books and Tracts in the retail departments during the year has nounted to £21,641 6s. 6½d.

The Foreign Translation Committee have also transacted much business in eir department of labor. The following is a short statement of the proceedgs of the Committee since its appointment in 1834:—

The Committee have issued translations of the Bible in French, Italian, utch, German, and Spanish. The Arabic Bible is in the course of printing. he New Testament has been published in Maltese, Polish, Arabic, and Ogybwa. he Gospel according to St. Matthew has been printed in the language of New aland; the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, in the language of the awak Indians, has been published; and the Gospels of St. Mark and St. ke, in the same language, are now in the press. The New Testament in Copc and Arabic has been published. The Prayer Book has been produced in ench, Dutch, German, Danish, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Modern Greek, odern Armenian, Maltese, Arabic, Turkish, Amharic, New Zealand, Ogybwa, uncey, and Cree, (North American Indian.)

One of the most important transactions of the Board during the year has en the aid rendered, by means of the Society, to the troops engaged in the defense of their country in the East, and to the brave men who have suffered om wounds or sickness. The consideration of their case excited the sympathy of the country at large, and called forth the earnest endeavors of this Society to minister relief and comfort to the sufferers. The steps commenced

by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in October, 1854, for the supply of Army Chaplains at the seat of war, afforded a suitable opening for the efforts of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in the gratuitous circulation of its publications in the Crimea, and in the wards of the hospitals in the East. Since the commencement of the war, upwards of fifteen hundred Bibles, fifteen hundred New Testaments, eighteen thousand Common Prayer Books, and Tracts, as well as works of general information and instruction, to the number of about fifty thousand, have been furnished gratuitously to the regiments in camp, and to the wounded and invalided inmates of the hospitals of Scutari, Kulalie, and Smyrna.

PRAYER BOOK AND HOMILY SOCIETY. FORTY-THIRD YEAR.

The Annual Sermon was preached by the Rev. J. C. Miller. The receipts for the year were £2,677 7*s.* 4*d.*, or about $15,000.

During the year there have been issued from the Depository, 19,419 Prayer Books; 17,657 Arranged Services, Family Prayer Books, Homilies in volumes, and other bound books; and 26,399 Homily and other Tracts.

Since its first institution, the Society has distributed 542,171 Prayer Books; 165,794 Arranged Services, Family Prayer-Books, Homilies in volumes, and other bound books; and 3,149,166 Tracts, consisting principally of Homilies, but including the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, Consecration Services, Festival Services, &c., &c. The Society's publications are issued in English, Irish, French, Russian, Polish, and Finnish.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND EDUCATION SOCIETY; SECOND ANNUAL REPORT.

This is a Society recently formed, and concerning which we, as yet, know too little to form an opinion. As to its avowed Object, the Society states, that the deficiency of education for the children of the poor in the country at large, and the importance of providing increased facilities for education on sound Protestant principles, make it imperative that members of the Church of England, who hold in their plain meaning her Evangelical Articles and formularies, should unite to form a Society, which shall have for its object:—To promote National Education on Protestant and Church of England principles, and to diffuse sound opinions on the subject.

To carry out these objects the Society seeks for support from all who desire to extend Scriptural education amongst the poorer classes. The funds with which the Society may be supplied will be devoted to the following purposes:

(A.) To assist in the establishment or support of schools by a grant towards the salary of the teacher, or for the purchase of school requisites. A power will be reserved by the Managing Committee to deal with special cases for grants towards building school-rooms when the funds will admit.

(B.) To afford pecuniary aid towards the training of young persons, who are satisfactorily recommended to the Committee as candidates for the office of teachers.

(C.) To supply information as to books of instruction for use in schools.

(D.) To make grants to Training Institutions for any purpose likely to increase their efficiency.

(E.) To promote through the press and otherwise the diffusion of sound views on the question of National Education, and to take all practicable means for furthering their adoption by persons in authority and by the public at large.

It appears that, while in the United States *one-sixth* of the entire population is at school, in England only one-ninth is at school; and that many of the teachers are so ignorant as to be obliged to sign their names with a mark. The Report states, also, that nearly 12,000, out of the 17,000 schools in connection with the Church of England, are so low in efficiency, as to forfeit a

se in the beneficial operation of the Minutes of the Committee of Council on ucation.

n the tendency to a godless system of Education, which is now confessedly wing in England, and which is the great fault in the schools in the United tes, a Society like this has cause for the most zealous activity. Nor, con- ering the supineness of the Church, need we wonder at the boldness and ivity of Dissent. Within twenty-five years the Church has made surprising rances, but there is a vast back-ground of endowed indifference yet to be ished.

MEETING OF CONVOCATION.

PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

The two Houses of Convocation for the province of Canterbury assembled Friday, Feb. 1st, at eleven o'clock; the Upper House in the Bounty-office, an's-yard, Westminster, and the Lower House in the Jerusalem Chamber joining.

THE UPPER HOUSE.

In the Upper House his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury presided, the dates present being the Bishops of Winchester, St. David's, Exeter, Chiches- r, Oxford, St. Asaph, Llandaff, Rochester, Lincoln, and Salisbury.

The proceedings having been opened with the Latin Litany, read by the shop of Salisbury, a message was sent to summon the Lower House to hear answer of the Home Secretary to the address to the Queen for a royal nce to consider and agree upon a canon or constitution for effecting modifi- ions in the representation of the clergy in that house.

REPRESENTATION OF THE CLERGY.

The Dean of Bristol, acting for the Prolocutor, accompanied by several mbers of the Lower House, appeared in compliance with the summons, and . *Travers Twiss* read the letter as follows:

"Whitehall, 7th August, 1855.

'My Lord Archbishop—I have had the honor to lay before the Queen the dress transmitted to me by your Grace on the 27th ultimo, from the Arch- hop, Bishops, and clergy of the province of Canterbury, assembled in Con- cation, praying her Majesty to grant them her royal licence to consider and ree upon a canon or constitution to be submitted to her Majesty's consider- on, for effecting modifications in the representation of the clergy in the wer House of Convocation.

'I have the honor to inform your Grace that this address was graciously eived by her Majesty, but that her Majesty has not been advised to comply th its prayer.—I have the honor to be, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's edient servant, G. GREY.

"His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury."

The Lower House then retired.

The Bishop of Oxford offered the following resolution:

"That his Grace be requested to desire the Lower House to take into con- deration the present state of the law affecting the discipline of the clergy, nd to appoint a Committee of their own body to prepare a report thereon nd present the same in the next session of Convocation."

This Resolution he sustained by a very able speech. He showed the neces- ity of making Convocation to represent more perfectly the clergy of the hurch, and of bringing the Church herself into a position to meet the wants f the people. The following are some of his remarks: "Of course there are n the Church at all times two entirely distinct parts. There is that which ime cannot alter in the slightest degree, the maintenance of dogmas, the

transmission of the faith once delivered to the saints, and the great organic machinery of the Church connected with the ministration of the Word and Sacraments. These cannot change in time or in place, because they come from Him with whom time and place are not. These, therefore, never can come into question, as to any change or alteration to be effected in them. But the Church has its human, as well as its spiritual machinery. * * * * It is on the strength of this conviction, your Grace, only that I for one desire to see, in some way or other, the power of internal consultation upon her own affairs revived in the Church of England. It is on that ground that I, for one, am convinced of its necessity, if we are to maintain the high position that God has given us in Catholic Christendom. It is not from any fanciful or antiquarian love of the particular body in which we are now sitting. On the contrary, I believe that very few persons' eyes are wider open than my own to the existence of many evils in the constitution of the Convocation of the province of Canterbury. There are many points on which I have continually apprehended risk and danger in carrying it on; but if internal consultations are needful to enable us to discharge our duties to the souls of men—if from the want of that elasticity of system which they alone can safely give us, we have lost—as we have lost, as I believe, numbers from our community in the years that are past—if the great Wesleyan secession might have been prevented by the Church having such an elasticity, and such a power of internal consultation—if the multitudes which are alienated from us in all other sects might have been prevented from being in any degree so numerous as they are—if the Church had been enabled to adapt herself to the spiritual wants of those among whom she worked—and if those evils of the past, instead of being diminished, are rather aggravated at the present time, I for one must say that whatever dangers attend the revival of internal consultation—of some species of synodal action—they are to be encountered rather than that we should sit still, knowing that our Church needs those adaptations, and yet not venture to attempt to begin the course which might lead to their being safely made."

The Bishop of Oxford also presented the following petition, numerously signed:

"*To the Most Rev., the Archbishop, the Right Rev., the Bishops, and the Rev., the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled.*

The humble petition of the undersigned Clergy and Laity;

Showeth—That your petitioners have observed with much thankfulness the progress which has been made towards the restoration of Synodal action.

That your petitioners believe it would materially conduce to the further progress of the cause, if your venerable Houses were to take into consideration a question on which there are strong feelings in the minds of many Churchmen—namely, that of providing in some way for the due expression of the mind of the faithful laity in matters affecting the welfare of the Church.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray your honorable Houses to take this important question into your early consideration. And sincerely trusting that you will be guided in all your deliberations by the Great Head of the Church, your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray."

LOWER HOUSE.

The Lower House assembled under the Presidency of the Dean of Bristol, the Prolocutor (the Dean of Ely) being too unwell to attend. A petition, praying Convocation to "provide in some way for the due expression of the mind of the faithful Laity in matters affecting the welfare of the Church," signed by 410 Clergymen, and upwards of 300 Laymen, was presented by Mr. Massingberd. A petition addressed to the Queen, praying for more stringent measures for enforcing sound discipline against offending Clergymen, was presented by Archdeacon Allen, but refused on the ground of informality. Canon Selwyn gave notice of a motion having for its object the revision of the authorised

sion of the Scriptures. Mr. Oxenden gave notice of an addition to the ations on Church Services, providing for the omission of certain repeti- s in the case of services being used together. Mr. Massingberd presented etition, soliciting the attention of the Upper House to the question of re- ing the divided members of Christ's body in our country, especially the leyan body. Chancellor Martin presented a report of the Committee of vamina on Church-rates, which was ordered to lie on the table for future con- ration. Mr. Gillett presented a petition praying for the amendment, and if the amendment, the preservation of the four State Services. The Archdea- of Coventry gave notice of a motion relative to a proper authorized hymnal. Prolocutor then produced a list of notices of motions now on the minutes, r which he was summoned to the Upper House. On his return he informed House that he had been directed by his Grace, the President, to form a mittee to take into consideration the present state of the Discipline of the rch. He therefore nominated the following as the Committee: The Deans Bristol, St. Paul's, and Salisbury, the Archdeacons of Middlesex, St. Albans, p, Maidstone, and Coventry, Dr. Jelf, Chancellor Martin, Canon Words- th, Messrs. Vincent, Gillett, Massingberd, and Bickersteth. The Prolocutor ing been again summoned to the Upper House, upon his return the House urned till April 15.

onvocation was finally prorogued to April 15. Although Government may rant the restoration of *legislative* power to Convocation, although it may in *judicial* power in the hands of men in whom the Church can have no fidence, yet of *consultative, deliberative,* and *effective* power to think and act the Church's good, Government cannot deprive Convocation.

CONVOCATION OF YORK.

he solemn and ridiculous farce was gone through with as usual of opening Body. The only member present was the Rev. Canon Trevor, Proctor for Clergy of the Archdeaconry of York. The proceedings were conducted the Canon in residence, (the Rev. W. Vernon Harcourt,) as one of the Com- sioners of the Archbishop, attended by the Deputy Registrar and his Grace's retary. The *Commissioner* commenced by reading the usual schedule recit- the Queen's writ for the assembly of Convocation, *pronouncing sentence of tumacy on all absent members,* and decreeing the Synod to be then and e proceeded in. The same document, however, goes on to "continue and rogue" the Convocation, *in the name of the Archbishop,* to some day beyond session of Parliament, so as to render it impossible for the Synod to be l at all.

n the whole there is no question that the Church is slowly but surely pre- ing the way for the restoration of Convocation to the full exercise of its per functions; at least so far as that no legislative action for the Church l be taken in Parliament, which has not already been passed in Convoca- . This is also apparent from the tone of the enemies of the Church. Thus *"Christian Times"* newspaper says: "Under the astute leadership of the iop of Oxford, they make their approaches with steps so noiseless and ie, that to a careless eye they seem to remain motionless; and it is only by trasting their positions at wide intervals of time, we can see what great ances have really been made. Not to go back to the history of the last years, when the soft and yielding temper of the Archbishop was first rborne by the subtle but energetic nature of Bishop Wilberforce, and he persuaded against his own judgment into allowing Convocation to sit at we may refer to what took place at the close of its last session."

peaking of the measures now adopted to secure more effective discipline of Clergy—the very thing which will take the wind out of the sails of the my—the same paper says: "The project will commend itself to many who are deeply grieved at the present state of anarchy into which the

Church is plunged; and on that ground we doubt not that it will be supported by many Churchmen. But it assumes another complexion altogether, if we recollect that these men have by no means abandoned the idea of erecting Convocation into a legislative body; that they can afford to bide their time, but are determined to snatch at the first opportunity to realize their long cherished schemes. Who knows how soon that opportunity may come? A political crisis—a tottering Ministry—a careless Premier—a Puseyite leader of the House of Commons—a hundred contingencies might be suggested, in which the Royal permission might be extorted; and the very measure thus prepared will be pointed to, whether Parliament should adopt it or not, as a proof of their competency for the higher purposes of legislation."

That opposition to Convocation will be fierce and relentless we do not doubt. The Premier of England, nominally a Presbyterian, is really, we suppose, an Arian. In a speech of his, made at a meeting of the Laborer's Encouragement Society, in London, November, 1854: "*You will find*," says he, "*that all children are born good*; it is bad education and bad associations in early life that corrupt the minds of man. It is true that there are now and then exceptions to the general principles. As there are men born with club feet; born blind, or with other personal defects, so also it will happen that children will be born with defective dispositions. Be persuaded, *that the mind and heart of man are naturally good, and it depends upon training and education whether that goodness implanted at birth shall continue to display itself, or whether by bad associations it shall be corrupted and destroyed.*"

We have the strongest proofs of the readiness of the Dissenters, *and their sympathizers in this country*, to chuckle over this opposition to Convocations on the part of Lord Palmerston! The man who withholds the Queen's letter from the Missionary Societies! and who, by the creation of "Life Peers" hopes to outvote the Bishops in the House of Lords!

SYNODICAL MOVEMENTS IN THE BRITISH COLONIAL CHURCHES.

In our July No. we gave some account of new movements to secure efficient Church organization and action in the Church at New Zealand, Melbourne and Toronto, in Upper Canada. We now record another important movement in the same direction in the Diocese of Montreal. A meeting of the clergy of the Diocese, and of Lay delegates from the several congregations, called by circular from the Bishop, to take into consideration the necessity or propriety of establishing a Diocesan Synod, was held in Montreal on Wednesday, January 14.

After Divine Service at the Cathedral, where the Bishop preached and the Holy Communion was administered, the meeting was held in the National School House, the Bishop presiding. The Rev. E. J. Rogers was appointed Clerical Secretary, and J. Armstrong, Esq., Lay Secretary. There were 41 clergy and 49 lay delegates present. In the Bishop's opening remarks, he alluded to the fact that they had already had the subject under discussion on two previous occasions. He described the anomalous state of things in the Colonies, and enumerated the ineffectual attempts repeatedly made to get their difficulties removed by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. After mentioning the last of these attempts and its failure, the Bishop added:

Then came the question, what was to be done? In 1853, in the Debate on the latter of these "Colonial Church Bills," the Attorney General, (Sir F. Thesiger,) had stated in his place in Parliament, "that the Church of England in the Colonies was in a most disadvantageous position, deprived of privileges and freedom of action possessed by other denominations, and by the Mother Church. This arose from the Colonies not having the Ecclesiastical Rights which exist in England, especially the jurisdiction of spiritual courts; in consequence of which the Colonial Bishop had an arbitrary and irresponsible power. But, as in his opinion, the Act of submission (25 Henry VIII) did not apply to the Colonies, it was not necessary to permit the Clergy and Laity there

e and make regulations, since no law forbade it; therefore the Bill tended to give a legal sanction to something not now sanctioned by bsequently the present Solicitor General, (Bethell,) Sir Fitzroy Kelly, r and Mr. Stephens, on special application from the Bishop of Ade- the following opinion:

e of opinion that the Act of Submission (25 Henry VIII, c. 19) does . to prohibit or render illegal the holding of Diocesan Synods within e of Adelaide.

" (Signed,) " Richard Bethell,
" Fitzroy Kelly,
" Joseph Napier,
" A. J. Stephens."

ynods are not illegal in the Colony of Adelaide, we may conclude Colony of Canada.

ıcipal debate was on the following Resolution: "Resolved, That ı necessity for the establishment of a Diocesan Synod within this This was finally altered so as to make such a Synod *desirable* rather ıecessity," and in this shape it passed by a vote of 33 to 8 of the d 30 to 14 of the Laity. The debates were long and earnest, and hat our Canadian brethren are becoming thoroughly awake to a of their rights, their duties and their dangers.

PARLIAMENTARY.

wing report of the doings of the last Parliament was crowded out nary No.

RELIGIOUS WORSHIP BILL.

ıftesbury's Bill which had passed the Lower House, was arrested in of Lords by the Earl of Derby, on the 15th of June. The Bill Act of William and Mary, and permits persons, without registering as Dissenters, on the payment of half a crown to meet and carry ı where they please and as they please. Lord Derby's motion to ill to a select committee was carried by a vote of 47 to 30. The passed both Houses. The *Clerical Journal* says: "Its object is to ecessary the registering or certifying the places of worship; and its Churchmen would be that, if any parties are dissatisfied with their ister, they can meet in a conventicle without the necessity of pro- ıemselves to be Dissenters. The law seems unexceptionable enough d we hope the measure may be thoroughly sifted as to its motives ge before it proceeds further. In defense of the Bill a Dissenting alludes to the aid it will give to the disaffected among us:

ge against the Bill, that it would afford facility for persons discon- ı the clergyman of a parish, to attend a species of worship which her be strictly private nor strictly public, is not a very serious one. urely be desirable that people be compelled to attend the ministra- clergyman with whom possibly they may be on bad terms, and for may have but little respect."

missioners for Subdividing Parishes have expressed themselves favor- removal of some sixteen of the City Churches.

CHURCH RATES BILL.

lay's bill was up for discussion on July 11, when Mr. R. Phillimore their own avowed determinations, that these Dissenters looked for- ı time when there would be a partition of all the endowments of , among all sects of religionists in the State; they candidly avowed

that this was their object, and they accepted the present measure merely as a stepping-stone towards the attainment of their greater object. He also stated that out of 9,904 parishes, only 314 have refused rates, and only 225 have contested them. The Bill was subsequently withdrawn.

The "Union of Contiguous Benefices Bill" has passed both Houses and has become a law. It shuts up certain Churches and alienates their endowments in quarters where Churches are not required or are thinly attended, and secures the union of weak or small parishes, and the employment of funds, &c., in more necessitous neighborhoods. Church-yards and the sites of Churches are not to be sold.

The "Cambridge University Bill" has been withdrawn.

REVIVAL OF CONVOCATION.

On Thursday, August 9th, *Mr. Kinnaird* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any address had been presented to her Majesty praying for the revival of Convocation, and whether any answer had been given to such address; and if he had any objection to lay copies of the same on the table of this house. *Sir G. Grey* said that an address upon the subject from the province of Canterbury had been presented, which had been laid before her Majesty, and an answer had been transmitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury. "Her Majesty had not been advised to comply with the terms of that address."

The *London Guardian*, of August 15th, in summing up the doings, and misdoings, and non-doings of the late Parliament, draws the following clever portrait of two of its most prominent members:

Lord Palmerston.—This session, further, has solved a great problem. It has given us Lord Palmerston's measure, which few people knew before. Borne into office with hopes and acclamation, as the one man who could worthily represent the country and carry on the war with energy and ability, he has settled down, in six months, into a testy official, incapable even of conceiving and upholding the dignity of his position in the House, with the jauntiness and coolness, but without the good humor or wit, which distinguished him in his various Secretaryships; unable to take his part in debate on an equality with his compeers, unable to raise enthusiasm or repress extravagance, and, as far as he has been yet tried, unable to impress any new vigor on the operations of war, or to direct in any strongly-marked channel the course of policy. If ever a Minister seemed to be drifting at the mercy of events, and entirely careless of the fact that he had neither plan nor force to meet and control them, it is the Premier, who last year was thought by many the ablest man in England, and who has not even left a speech in the records of the session—a session held during one of the most anxious and stirring moments of the country's history—which people might remember and appeal to as a proof that he at least understood and felt the greatness of his post.

Lord John Russell.—But the session has had its hero. It is preëminently Lord John Russell's session. There is a poetical and dramatic completeness in his appearance throughout it. He is great at the beginning of it, great in the middle, and if not great, at least singular, at the end. The session opens with an unexpected effect, produced by this great master of bold and strange strokes, which at once gave a strong color to all that followed. Then he seems to hold the destinies of his country, and the choice of peace and war, in his hands at Vienna, and holds diplomatic arguments, and points history, against the trained and crafty statesmen of the Continent. He fails, but he is soon back in the eager and expectant House, which is anxious to hear from such lips the secrets of the Conferences and the prospects of the future. The Commons seem to hear

e who has had all the threads of negotiation in his hands, and who
) be master of the whole question—*seem* to hear from him the clear and
announcement that war, as it has been inevitable, must be carried on
any looking back. But very soon Lord J. Russell absorbs the interest
louse in a very different capacity. He figures in a scene which throws
back-ground even the strange opening of the session. The Ambassador
l defended the *ultimatum* for war, had in reality urged conditions of
The Cabinet Minister who had exhorted in Parliament to resist Russia
eath, had been overruled in the Council as the advocate of a proposal
ing to terms with her. Everything comes out at last; and so did this,
l the awkwardness of a disclosure, attempted to be staved off, ungrace-
ide, and suspiciously explained. He began as an accuser; he went on to
)lomatist; he came back as an oracle; he was listened to as an assertor
nal right, and an inflamer of patriotic ardor; after all this, he had to
n that same floor of the House, and defend himself as a state criminal,
nidst of scandal and suspicion and indignation, and to resign himself an
ng victim, to avoid bringing down the Ministry with him in his fall.
, the fallen statesman takes leave of the session of which he has been
ding character, with a melancholy and desponding discourse, which
) bring him before us in the character of a prophet, because his speech
igly repels sympathy from all sides alike, and because no one can tell
e meant by it, or why he made it.

)opsis of the doings of the Parliament now in Session will be given here-
Besides the usual amount of Church intermeddling, Life Peerages,
an Affairs, the Peace Conference at Paris, &c., are occupying its atten-
Mortification at the secondary part England has played in the East, and
sition to make it up by blustering at Brother Jonathan, are apparent
. The "Life Peer" Bill, which, if passed, would have done much to
ionize the Government, has failed in the House of Lords; and the Sun-
secration Bill has been rejected in the Lower House by the vote of 376

THE PEACE CONFERENCE AT PARIS.

the 25th of February the following Plenipotentiaries met in Paris to
, if possible, the termination of the War in the East and the repose of
):

ice—Count Colonna Walewski, Baron de Bourqueney.
land—Earl of Clarendon, Lord Cowley.
ria—Count de Buol-Schauenstein, Baron de Hubner.
key—Aali Pacha, Mehemed Djemil Bey.
linia—Chevalier Massimo d'Azeglio.
sia—Count Orloff, Baron Brunow.
rious accounts added Count Cavour, giving Sardinia two representatives,
me as the other Powers.
is Napoleon has already secured his great object by this War: he is a
presence in Europe. Great Britain went into it without knowing why,
akes peace for the same reason. This War has already cost the British
nment, according to Mr. Gladstone's estimate, not less than *two hundred*
millions of dollars.

IRELAND.

TH OF MR. LUCAS.—Mr. Frederick Lucas, M. P. for Meath, after a linger-
lness, died on Wednesday last, at the house of his brother-in-law, Mr.
, at Staines. Frederick Lucas, the second son of Mr. Samuel Lucas, a
er of the Society of Friends, was called to the bar of the Middle Temple
ter Term, 1838, and in the following year became a member of the Roman
lic Church. The grounds of his conversion he gave to the world at the

time, in the shape of a pamphlet, called *Reasons for becoming a Roman Catholic*, especially addressed to the Society of Friends. As a Roman Catholic barrister he took an active part in the proceedings of the Catholic Institute, and started the *Tablet* newspaper in London in 1840, for the purpose of disseminating the most Ultramontane doctrines of his Church. He also was a frequent contributor to the pages of the *Dublin Review*. In 1849 he removed the *Tablet* newspaper to Dublin, and has continued to conduct it there since that time. He was also one of the secretaries of the Irish Tenant League during the brief period of its existence. In 1852 he was elected, through the influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood, as member for the county of Meath, in the place of Mr. Henry Grattan, who had represented it for many years. He has always lived a life of political and religious strife; and, having advocated in the *Tablet* the right of the Irish priesthood to interfere in politics, and being rebuked by the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, he went to Rome early in the present year to prosecute his appeal against Dr. Cullen's decision. The appeal was decided against him, and the result was the entire prostration of Mr. Lucas's physical system, and his premature death at the early age of forty three. Mass was offered on Wednesday morning in all the Roman Catholic chapels of the metropolis for the repose of Mr. Lucas's soul. In private life he was a most worthy character. He leaves behind him a widow, the daughter of the late Mr. Wm. Ashby, of Staines, and an only son.

Mr. C. G. Duffy, also Member of Parliament and compeer of Mr. Lucas in agitation, has given up Ireland in despair, and sailed for Australia.

BIBLE BURNING IN IRELAND.

The *Clerical Journal* has the following:

A display of fanaticism has been lately made at the Romish chapel-yard of Kingstown, near Dublin; several copies of our authorized version of the Scriptures having been burned there as a holocaust, by men calling themselves *Redemptorists*, and who rejoice in the outlandish names of De Buggenoms, Theunis, Petcherine, &c. These veritable firebrands are traversing the whole country, fomenting bitterness and division, and stirring up the Romish population against their Protestant neighbors. The scandalous crime of the Bible-burning is vehemently denied by the Romish prints, although scorched and half-burnt leaves of the sacred volume, which were blown about by the wind or otherwise secured, are in the possession of scores of persons in the neighborhood of Kingstown, and although the fact has been attested by many clergymen and laymen of our own Church, as well as by the Wesleyan and Independent ministers of the town. The fire was kept burning for two hours and a half, and, together with copies of the Sacred Scriptures, several books of Common Prayer were consumed, all having been made to pass through the fire as an offering to the grim and ferocious Moloch of priestly bigotry and intolerance. At the Mayo Assizes, in Spring, 1852, it may be remembered that a monk, called "Brother John," was convicted of burning a Protestant Bible, near Ballinrobe; and it is most earnestly desired that the perpetrators of the recent outrage may be also brought to punishment. The *Tablet* of that year highly approved of the act, saying that they "agreed in this particular with 'Brother John'—to scoff at the book which he scoffed at, and to pronounce it a book put together by some of the most active friends and servants of *the Fire-king*—in other words, "*the book of the devil;*'"—while the notorious Dr. Cahill made the "astounding assertion," as the editor of the *Catholic Layman* rightly designates it, that "he would rather a Catholic should read the worst books of immorality than the Protestant Bible." (*Vide* the *Tablet*, Dec. 17, '53, p. 804.)

The Society for Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics, have been turning the late cremation to account, and have published a placard on the subject, which in town and country, at all sides, now stares us in the face. The Redemptorist fathers have kindled a flame which will not expire in the chapel-

ingstown. The placard adverted to runs thus:—"Why do Roman riests hate and burn the Bible?—Is it not because they feel as the ing Ahab felt towards Micaiah, the Prophet of the Lord? 'There is of whom we may ask the will of the Lord, but I hate him, for he ophesieth good to me but always evil.'—Paralipomenon, xvii, 7. *atholic Bible.* Who, then, should burn the Bible?"

mish priests who participated in this crime of burning God's Word, arraigned for trial and acquitted. A large meeting of papists was held on Sunday, for political electioneering purposes, &c., when a priest, McEvoy, delivered himself as follows:

ave seen those pious, and learned, and laborious ministers, who have, e last few weeks, given the benefit of the priceless blessings of their ions to the people of Kingstown, those ministers of the altars, those l servants of the Lord, about to be sent into the dock upon a charge ese good men had again and again declared to be false. Would you at is the nature of that charge? It was that of committing to the hing which pretends to be the Bible, but which is a vile and blasphe- version and corruption of the Word of God. (Cheers.) It was for ng to the flames a volume which, if I myself, in the absence of attor- ral and solicitors-general, were going to commit to the flames, I should p with a pair of tongs for fear of soiling my fingers—(tremendous —and so with the tongs would I hurl it into the consuming fire! d cheering.") &c. &c.

POPERY IN A BAD WAY.

—At a meeting of the Consistory of the Cardinals at Rome, Aug. 26th, s IX pronounced several allocutions, which show that religiously, not politically, the system of Popery is sinking into contempt in several ents of the old world. The Pope avows the most ultra doctrines iberty of conscience; and shows that a fatal breach is made between nd several of the "Most Catholic Majesties" of Europe. The follow- xtracts from his Allocutions on the above occasion:

IA.—"'We say with sorrow not only that the Piedmontese Government ent ear, either to the supplications of its Bishops or our own exhorta- t making new and more serious attacks on the Church, on our authori- n that of the Apostolic See—openly despising our reiterated protests paternal warnings—has not feared to approve, sanction, and promul- law on religious houses.'

—"'Laws have been passed which, to the great damage of religion, he first and second articles of the Concordat, and which order the sale roperty of the Church. Various decrees have been published, by ishops are interdicted from conferring sacred orders; by which virgins ted to God are prohibited from admitting other women into their insti- and by which lay chaplaincies and other pious institutions are to be ly secularized.'

sing our voice in your assembly, we complain of all that the lay Gov- has done and is still doing in Spain, unjustly against the Church, its liberty and rights, against us, and the authority of the Holy See; cially we deeply deplore our solemn Concordat violated in defiance of ional law; the authority of the Bishops prevented in the exercise of ed ministry; the violence employed against them; and the patrimony hurch usurped in spite of all divine and human laws. We, therefore, e of our apostolic authority, censure, abrogate, and declare without d without force, null and of no effect, for the past and the future, the s and decrees. Lastly, we call on the authors of all these audacious d we exhort and supplicate them to consider seriously that those who fear to afflict and torment the Holy Church of God cannot escape the f the Almighty.'

SWITZERLAND.—"'After a few words of praise to the Bishops Spain, and to the faithful who have supported them, the Pope c brief reference to the woes which afflict the Church in Switzerla

"'We must also tell you, venerable brethren, that we suffer at the deplorable state to which our most holy religion i Switzerland, and especially—oh, sorrow!—in some of the prin towns of the confederated cantons. There the power of the Ca and of its liberty are oppressed, the authority of the Bishop Apostolic See are trampled under foot, the sanctity of marriage a violated and despised, the seminaries of priests and the monasteri families are either entirely destroyed or completely subjected to power of the civil Government, the nomination of benefices and cal possessions is usurped, and the Catholic clergy are persecute deplorable manner. But on that occasion he could only menti things, which could not be sufficiently lamented, and which n reprobation'—and that he would dwell on them at length on a fu nity. His Holiness concluded by calling on the assembly to pray the God of mercy 'to aid His Holy Church, which is overwhelme calamities!'"

It is a remarkable fact also concerning Pius IX, *at home*, surro "own children," as he calls them, that without the protection of nets his life would not be safe for a moment. And yet this w system, falling to pieces from internal putrefaction, which has vi the countries which it curses with infidelity, adulteries, murders crimes against the Decalogue, that this same rotten system is as ever, and is able still to fascinate silly men and silly women.

FRUITS OF THE "NEW DOGMA."

The fruits of the "New Dogma" continue to appear from time Oswald, in a book entitled "Mariology," maintains Mary's real pr Eucharist. This nonsense is just condemned by the "Congregati dex." But they will have more to do yet.

NEW POLICY AT ROME.

The *Literary Churchman* says, "Next to the countless celebr 'new Dogma' all over Europe, the year just closed will be the mo for the revival by the Pope of the Court of Bishops of different c are to surround him henceforth as Cardinals in Rome. Taken i with the spreading mania for Concordates with different Roman C ers, the plan of having the ablest and most tried representativ nations as a Cabinet of Propagandism is perhaps the subtlest of all forts of Pius the Ninth. Such combinations are so like conspiraci other nations, that politicians will be obliged to enquire a little r ing them. The prelates now called by his Holiness to the purple court from France, De Rauscher from Austria, Di Pietro from Reisach from Bavaria, the Dominican Father Gaude, Grassellini fr Gianuzzi and De Medici, already about the person of the Pope. C said that one at least will retain his see, viz, De Rauscher of V number of Cardinals of the *Curia* at present is twenty-nine; of th pertain to the Roman States, four to Piedmont, three to Naples, Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, one to Tuscany, and one to Corsica of things is the result of the European revolutions of the last ger will be remedied by the Pope's new scheme. A considerable prep Roman Cardinals will still be retained, but not so great as at p thought of recurring to this (which is called the ancient plan Government) is so eagerly extolled in Rome, that a 'special inspir is affirmed as the only way of accounting for the rise of the idea in the Pope's mind."

☞ **NOTE.—A large amount of Continental Intelligence is laid c**

THE

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. IX. JULY, 1856. No. 2.

ART. I.—HIGH CHURCH AND LOW CHURCH.

1. *The Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register.* New Haven, Ct.
2. *The Protestant Episcopal Quarterly Review.* New York.
3. *The True Catholic.* Baltimore, Md.
4. *The Southern Episcopalian.* Charleston, S. C.
5. *The Spirit of Missions.* New York.
6. *The Churchman's Monthly Magazine.* New York.
7. *Christian Witness and Church Advocate.* Boston, Mass.
8. *The Gospel Messenger.* Utica, N. Y.
9. *The Churchman.* New York.
10. *The Protestant Churchman.* New York.
11. *The Church Journal.* New York.
12. *The Parish Visitor.* New York.
13. *The Children's Magazine.* New York.
14. *The Carrier Dove.* New York.
15. *The Episcopal Recorder.* Philadelphia.
16. *Banner of the Cross.* Philadelphia.
17. *Southern Churchman.* Alexandria, Va.
18. *The Western Episcopalian.* Gambier, Ohio.
19. *The Calendar.* Hartford, Ct.

THIS is a goodly array of periodicals, to be published and paid for, read and digested in a Church, numbering about one hundred

and six thousand Communicants. We have placed the "Church Review" at the head of the list, not from a vain-glorious feeling, but simply out of regard to its age and size; although some of our newspapers are accustomed to speak of its young brother, "The Protestant Episcopal Quarterly," as the "stateliest and most valuable" of Church periodicals. We are in our ninth year; our "stately" contemporary is only two years old; and notwithstanding we have had from the first to earn our own living, and he is said to have been born "with a golden spoon in his mouth," we are not disposed, in this Republican country, to yield the palm to him on this account.

Let it not be supposed, however, that we have arranged the long catalogue which heads this Article, according to seniority, merit, or any similar principle. Just imagine what would ensue, if we should venture to give an opinion as to the comparative value of these Quarterlies, Monthlies, and Hebdomadals; pronouncing upon their respective literary excellence, soundness of doctrine, fairness and good temper in controversy. What would be the consequence, if we should intimate, in the most delicate and friendly manner, that the "Y— Z—" is not a model of intellectual strength, or as piquant and interesting as it might be; that it cribs a little too much from other papers and serves up the news after it is somewhat stale; that it is not always as chivalrous and courteous as St. Paul would be, under similar circumstances; what sort of a notice would the paper give of us? Something like the following:—"We have received the July No. of the Church Review. While there are occasional articles in this periodical that we can conscientiously commend, it gives us pain to state that too often sentiments are inscribed upon its pages, which are utterly at variance with our formularies of doctrine, and with Holy Scripture. It professes not to be identified with party and to represent the general views of the Church; but there is a deadly virus of error infecting its leaves, which the truly pious mind will readily detect. In judging others, it seems moreover to have a singular obtuseness of vision, and to be guided only by a blind and bitter prejudice. We hardly need to add, that we have no reference whatever to the views which are expressed in this No., of the religious press. We do not expect to receive candid consideration in that quarter."

Or, suppose we should try to be complimentary, and congratulate "The W— X—" upon the uniform tone of its editorials, in the topics and their mode of treatment, as indicative of a most zealous and exclusive devotion to what the writer considers the only form of truth worth considering; upon the ex-

emplary care with which the Editor prevents his readers from getting, through his columns, any adequate notion of anything which he sees fit to oppose; upon the magnificent assumption with which he criticises what would be impossible for him to comprehend; or, upon the delicate roughness with which he handles the reputation of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, whose Office he professes almost idolatrously to venerate. What sort of a notice should we have from that region? Curt and comprehensive like this:—"The Church Review has fallen from its High estate into the hands of the Low Church faction. We advise our readers to drop it."

Now such words as these would be unpleasant, and, what is worse, they might lead some weak-minded brethren to withdraw their patronage; therefore we will not even intimate that our Religious Newspapers are not as immaculate, high-toned and truthful, as though they were edited by Apostles and printed by angels.

This thought, however, will force itself upon us; whether an equal amount of benefit would not accrue to the Church; whether there would not be somewhat less of personal bickering and petty controversy; whether these publications could not afford to make themselves more effective; if we had ten periodicals, where now we have twenty. It is as easy to make up a paper to be read by twenty thousand subscribers, as by two thousand; and the larger the subscription list, the greater is the stimulus and the wider are the facilities, to render the sheet worth reading. This suggestion we feel can be offered with safety; because every Editor will presume, if the number of Church periodicals should be reduced, he is the whale that must swallow up the little fishes.

Why is it that these publications are proportionally so much more numerous, in the Episcopal Church, than in other religious bodies? Are we such a reading community, and have we such a special hankering after this sort of literature, that nothing less can supply our wants? Two-thirds of our people neither take or read any religious periodical. The "Spirit of Missions" ought to have ten subscribers, where now it has one; a becoming sense of propriety forbids our saying how many should take the "Church Review." Do the different regions of the country require their own organs of communication, specially adapted to the necessities and peculiarities of those localities? To some extent this is true; but it does not explain the fact that we have sometimes two, and sometimes half a dozen periodicals, in the same city. Everybody knows that most of our papers are established to sustain the policy and views of some particu-

lar section in the Church; and that if we were all of one mind, many of them would soon die a natural death. This brings us to the topic that we design to consider, which is, not directly the religious press, but a subject intimately connected with it, and almost as delicate and difficult to treat, without giving offense.

It is peculiar to the American Protestant Episcopal Church, that she retains her unity of organization and fellowship, through all the surgings of parties. Individuals at times drop off on the right hand and the left; but no body of men ever leave her and set up a new communion. This is not true of any other Protestant organization in the land. We have Old School and New School Presbyterians; Orthodox and Unitarian Congregationalists; Gurneyite and Hicksite Quakers; Methodist Church North, and Methodist Church South; Calvinistic, Free-Will, Six-Principle, Seventh Day, and fifty other kinds of Baptists; but only one body of Protestant Episcopalians. We are sometimes reproached, because of this tendency to cohesion, and it is said, we cannot be sundered, for the same reason that a rotten log is not easily split;—the axe buries itself to the haft in the soft punk and sticks there. We do not know precisely what this means; we certainly have enough of the life of controversy, and a most tender "mutual watch and care," in respect of all dogmatic questions. We have a superabundant legislative life, and have probably done more law-making than any other Christian community in modern times; our Book of Canons, for elaborateness, minuteness and complication, is, in its way, quite a curiosity. Is it the want of spiritual life? is it a prevailing spirit of indifferentism as to the great fundamentals of the Gospel, that holds us together? There are Gallios in the Church, fancy religionists, dilettante theologians, men who inherit their religion as they do the family-plate, and value it on the same ground. But it is a slander to say that there is not amongst us as much genuine and healthy earnestness, as true an interest in the Faith, as can be found anywhere else. In this respect, we do not suffer by comparison with others. The Gospel of Christ is fervently, zealously and faithfully preached, by High-Churchmen and by Low-Churchmen. There are indeed "spots in our feasts of charity," and so there were, when inspired Apostles presided over the Church.

It is certainly a question worthy of serious consideration, what it is which binds the Episcopal Church into one cohesive body, while political, practical and doctrinal differences are sundering all other Protestant Communions. This Church is

subject to the same outward pressure, it is made up of the same human material, and there is amongst us the same variety of opinion, as to the social questions which agitate the community. But there is an all-controlling force in the principle, recognized universally amongst us, that the Church is a *Divine organization* in all its essential forms as well as dogmas. Growing out of this principle there is a sentiment of loyalty, which pervades Clergy and Laity of all grades of Churchmanship; and this is so strong that no supposed or real grievance ever suggests the fatal remedy of schism.

There is another peculiarity of this Church, which makes it possible for conscientious men, of different views, to live in outward unity; and that is the breadth of our doctrinal basis. The Faith of the Church is that which has been received from the beginning. Her Creed is historical, not metaphysical. While there may be a general assent to a certain philosophical digest of doctrine, no one has a right to judge his brother by any unwritten law. If the General Convention should set forth an exposition of the Faith, in accordance with the peculiar views of either party in the Church, and make this authoritative, the bond of unity would be instantly and irrevocably sundered. The free play of private judgment is based upon the universal deference to primitive authority; this allows motion about a fixed point, and while there may be a degree of occasional aberration, all revolve around the same central sun.

And in these two general principles we have the only sure ground of organic or doctrinal Unity. Among the Congregationalists every parish organizes itself after its own fashion, and makes its own Creed. This is an actual renunciation of the principle of Unity. The Presbyterians meet together in General Assembly, and legislate into being a Confession of Faith, in which the most minute and subtle points of doctrine are moulded into an elaborate, rigid, cast-iron system, which it would require a lifetime of study to comprehend with sufficient thoroughness, for one intelligently to affirm or deny it. There can be no catholic consent to such a scheme as this. The Romanist recognizes an unchangeable and infallible tribunal, which is constantly adding to the substance of the Faith. The Unity of his Church must therefore be, at the same time, a fixed and a variable quantity.

That the oneness of the Protestant Episcopal Church must rest upon some very substantial basis, is proved by the fact of her having passed safely through ordeals, which, amongst other bodies of Christians, would have resulted, if not in a

general division, at least in the secession of a large section *en masse*. The time has not yet come for an impartial and complete history of what is called the Oxford Tractarian Movement. All will allow, however, that the integrity and essential Protestantism of the Church could hardly have been subjected to a severer test than has been endured during the last fifteen or twenty years. The feeling in which the Oxford movement *originated*, must have the sympathy of every American Churchman, let his party predilections be as they may. We must bid God speed to every honest effort that is made to take the Church of England out of the control of the State, and secure to her an independent life. There is not a more extraordinary anomaly on the face of the earth than this, of a body, claiming a Divine origin, a Divine Constitution, a Divine Creed, and yet legislated for by a Parliament, liable to be made up of Jews, infidels and heretics! her Bishops appointed by the Crown! questions of doctrine determined by Civil Courts! discipline impossible except at great pecuniary cost! and Church livings in the hands of individuals, who may, if they please, sell them to the highest bidder! But the Oxford writers very soon assumed a revolutionary, rather than a reformatory aspect. As has often been the case in matters both political and ecclesiastical, these men in the beginning little dreamed whereunto their efforts would grow, and would have repelled with honest indignation the charge that the ablest of them would eventually be landed in the Church of Rome. And yet it is now very evident that they were engrafting into the Church a foreign element, which, if it had taken vital hold, would have entirely superseded the Reformed Faith. The Church of England would not, perhaps, have bowed her neck before the feeble old gentleman, who tyrannizes over the Italian States;—political and social reasons might have prevented this;—Dr. Newman and his friends would probably never have assumed the Papal livery; but the Anglican Communion would have become, in rites, dogma, and modes of influence, a new existence; she would have sundered herself from the Science, the Literature, and the progressive life of the age; free and living men would have gradually repudiated allegiance to her standard; intolerance would have triumphed over charity; the simplicity of the Faith would have been overlayed and smothered with meretricious subtleties; and infidelity armed with weapons forged in the armories of the Church. At the time when the Oxford Tracts first gained attention on the other side of the Atlantic, there was little in the condition of the Episcopal Church in this country

that would indicate the probability of their obtaining any extensive hold amongst us. The lethargy of a former period had been shaken off; the Church had entered upon a new career of enterprise and growth; the Gospel was preached in her pulpits with fresh fervor; Missionary labors at home and in foreign lands were energetically commenced; religious services were multiplied; Clerical Associations for intellectual and spiritual improvement were formed in many of our Dioceses; the lines of party seemed to be quietly fading out; Christians of various names, weary of strife and schism, were turning towards this Church with anxious interest; large accessions came to the ranks of our Clergy from the Ministry of different denominations, and from Maine to Georgia we took up the song,

> "Triumphant Zion, lift thy head,
> From dust, and darkness, and the dead."

At this crisis, there came a voice over the sea from the cloisters of Oxford, which met with a wonderfully harmonious response in the American branch of the Church. New usages suddenly appeared, or at least obsolete forms re-appeared; bells rung for daily matins and vespers that had been heard before only on the Sundays; white linen appeared in pulpits where black silk had been used to rustle; Chancels were cleared of lumbering furniture to make way for elevated Altars; the Fathers began to be quoted instead of the Reformers; certain of the Low Church brethren suddenly shot up fifty degrees above their old-fashioned High Church neighbors; some exacted, others groaned; some predicted a speedy Millenium, and others the final apostasy and the end of the present Dispensation. Some good things were done, and many that were foolish and absurd; the general effect of the movement was division within the Church, and distrust without. Notwithstanding all this, the Church has made great progress during the last twenty years, but no one can tell how much faster it would have grown, if these obstructions had not lain in the way.

But the force of the Tractarian onslaught may now be fairly considered as broken. We still hear the heaving of the ground-swell, that follows the tempest, and occasionally a stick or two of drift-wood is thrown upon the banks of the Tiber as a memorial of the storm, but the raging of the winds is over. That this movement has passed its crisis appears in the fact that the literature to which it gave birth, is no longer in demand; the books lie uncalled for on the dusty shelves of the publishers. They may be bought very cheap at the "Trade

Sales." They were never very readable, whether written on one side of the controversy or the other, and nothing but the excitement of the contest could ever have given them currency. Soon after the appearance of a famous Tract on Baptism, we heard a clerical friend remark that he had read it through three times without detecting its meaning, and had now commenced to read it backward, with the hope of better success. Scraps from the Fathers on the one side, long citations from the Reformers on the other; catenas to prove this, opposite catenas to prove that; *disjecta membra*, from which the most accomplished Theological Cuvier would find it impossible to determine the original species of the writer; one who was cut off from all other resources, and shut up for life in a solitary cell, might manage to digest this, but it is marvelous that free-agents should ever have chosen such a style of reading. As we have before remarked, the original impulse of the Tractarian movement is spent; and the leaders have either made their submission to the Roman pontiff, or retired from public observation. The Church has lost some whom it could poorly afford to spare, and others who will not be greatly missed.

In accordance with the natural law of re-action, we may anticipate that the next aggressive and energetic party action will come from the opposite side of the Church. The popular impression that "Tractarianism" is the legitimate development of High Church principles, and Popery the inevitable terminus of "Tractarianism," gives to the antagonistic party at the present moment an important advantage. And no candid person will deny that the "Evangelical" section of the Church has sometimes rendered important service in sustaining or reviving the flame of spiritual life, when it seemed ready to perish. Some of the brightest names that adorn the records of the Church, both in England and America, are those of men who were distinctively and avowedly members of that party. We do not indeed estimate these eminent Christians exactly by the standard of their biographies; the "Lives of the Saints," ancient and modern, generally contain somewhat of the mythical element. We never meet in real life, any persons who are precisely like those we read of in good books, and there is no doubt that many of those excellent men, whose memories have been embalmed in sweet spices by their admiring biographers, if they should read their own Lives in Paradise, would be not a little astonished to find that they had walked so uniformly in the ante-chamber of Heaven, while in the flesh. Making, however, all due allowance for the excessive laudation which is heaped upon the memory of departed believers, we must

still allow that no party of men in any Church can point to a more goodly array of devoted, self-sacrificing, and holy servants of Christ, than the "Evangelical" section of the Anglican and American Episcopal Communion. We are indebted to them in a great measure for the religious enterprise which now distinguishes the operations of the Church; they sounded the trumpet of alarm when Christians were slumbering in Zion, and the higher spiritual life that we enjoy is, in a large degree, attributable to the solemn protest which they uttered against the indifference, the worldliness, the formal routine, the frigid ethics, which characterized both Laity and Clergy, during the greater part of the last century.

At the same time, it is not to be desired that this, or any other party, should secure exclusive control of the Church. The range of thought and sentiment and action, which the "Evangelical" system allows, is too narrow to allow it to become the basis of Catholic Union. There are faculties belonging to our nature, which it does not recognize, at least in their connection with religion; it revolves too exclusively around a few, fixed dogmas, which are regarded as embracing the whole Gospel; it sets forth a type of religious life, which is somewhat technical, and too entirely divorced from the ordinary processes of the mind and heart; it makes too little of moral growth and culture, and too much of its own spiritual specifics; and notwithstanding its protest against formalism, it sometimes clings to the letter, at the cost of the spirit.

It is, again, more or less directly affiliated with a theology, which is saved from fatalism only by becoming illogical; which in its *theory*, represents all personal effort on the part of the sinner as useless or superfluous; exhibits God as dealing with His creatures in the character of an arbitrary Sovereign; sin as the result of an arbitrary connection with our first parents; and salvation as deliverance from an arbitrary penalty.

Neither does this system fairly meet the intellectual necessities of the world. It takes too much for granted; reasons too much in a circle; shrinks too sensitively from criticism; evades objections which it ought to solve; ignores too uniformly the suggestions of Science, and relies too confidently upon its own infallibility. Its power consists, mainly, in the hold which it gets upon the religious sensibilities; the earnestness of the teacher enkindles a corresponding earnestness in his hearer.

But when the "Evangelical" *formula* remains, after the pious spirit which pervaded and worked it, has evaporated, and it degenerates into the mere watch-word of a party, there is nothing more tedious and unedifying. In its best estate, it is not

always a genial and whole-sided form of religion; it is apt to assume that all religious emotions are spurious, which do not coëxist with its own precise dogmatic belief; it is somewhat given to sit in rigid censorship upon those who hold a different form of Faith; it is eloquent in defense of the abstract right of private judgment, but woe to him who exercises that right in the wrong direction! and though it recognizes the three Christian graces of "faith, hope, and charity," it would never have originated the statement that "the greatest of these is charity."

We speak now of this system in its more extreme and partisan development; and if this form of ultraism should ever get control of the Church, we may look for a very uncomfortable amount of proscription and intolerance. If, however, the genuine piety, the ardent zeal, the active holiness, which have made the name of "Evangelicalism," in its best manifestations, so sacred, could be combined with true conservatism, the blessed freedom of the Gospel, cultivated taste, and a liberal comprehensiveness; if this system could be brought into harmony with the higher forms of Science and Art, Philosophy and Literature, we should have such a glorious combination, that all party lines would be utterly and forever obliterated. As it is, it would be disastrous if either of those extremes which exist amongst us, should get a clear and indisputable supremacy. There is, indeed, little cause to apprehend that such will be the case; the great body of our Clergy are quietly discharging their proper duties, with very little interest in the warfare which a few uneasy spirits are disposed to wage, and the mass of the Laity do not even know what are the points in dispute. We are in no danger of being brought under an ecclesiastical or a dogmatic yoke,—the genius of the Church forbids it; neither are we exposod to the disruptions of schism,—the genius of the Church forbids this also; no Diocese, no body of men amongst us, dare hint at Nullification.

And still there are certain movements which indicate that we may be called to settle this practical question:—whether the Unity of the Church shall be a mere *formal Unity*, or not? We may retain our present organization intact, and all our articles, usages and forms remain as they are, while, so far as concerns our Missionary operations, the education of Candidates for Holy Orders, and the dissemination of Religious Literature, we act as two distinct bodies; so that, while we call ourselves one Church, acknowledge one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, we are operating upon the world in opposite directions. Both parties will allow that such a state of things is to be deprecated; but each says, it is better than it would be to allow the opposite side to have control of our Institutions.

Is there then no common ground, broad enough to allow all the loyal sons of the Church to stand together, and work together? If not, then the boasted Unity of the Church is a delusion. If there is no definite System of Truth, clearly revealed in her formularies, and which contains all that the Christian needs to know for his soul's health, then we say that the Church has not *one* Faith, or any particular Faith at all. If we must incorporate into our oral or printed teaching, shreds of Romish doctrine, fragments of mediaeval nonsense; or, on the other hand, cull our theology from the fields of Geneva and the pastures of Dissent; if we must supersede the simple, historical Faith which distinguishes this Church from other Christian bodies, substituting for it the refined and sublimated schemes of doctrine, which men have elaborated; if we must go out of our way to affirm, or deny, the validity of Orders and Ordinances, with which we have no practical concern, at the risk of being branded as "unsound Churchmen" by one party, or as "unevangelical" by the other; if either Sacramental or forensic theories of Justification, are to be made the tests of orthodoxy, then farewell to peace and unity.

And while we are contending about matters, which few will dare affirm are vital to our salvation, what is going on around us? While we are defining the operations of Grace in Baptism, and localizing the Divine presence in the Eucharist, what recognition is there of either Sacrament by the great majority of men? While we are philosophizing over the nature of Original Sin, and contending about the diagnosis of depravity, what are the workings of "actual transgression" in the community? While we are discussing the relative authority of the Church and the Scriptures, what are our young men learning from Strauss, and Hennel, and Newman, and Gregg? The whole tone of modern Literature, scientific, philosophical, ethical, poetical, critical, historical, periodical, clearly shows that there is soon to be a mighty contest, in which the fact of a Supernatural Religion will be the point at issue. What preparation are we making for the battle? We may say, carelessly, it will only be the old objections over again, and they have been disposed of already; there is nothing new to be urged on either side. No man who really knows anything of the matter; no man who has read the rationalistic and infidel writers of the day; no man who is familiar with the subtle and ingenious modes with which they ply the argument of unbelief, will dare to dismiss the subject in this summary way. We may hide our heads in the sand, when the enemy approaches; we may presume upon the ignorance of our auditors, measuring their intelligence

by our own; we may go on, week after week, administering stale platitudes to dozing congregations; we may jog along in our little circle of routine, like the blind mule who grinds bark in the mill, and after traveling all day, always finds himself at night where he started in the morning; we may affirm and re-affirm that everything is settled, but this does not hinder the earth from heaving.

And while the cohorts of infidelity are wheeling into line on one side, on the other there lies a huge mass of worldliness and indifference,—multitudes who do not care enough about religion to disbelieve, and upon these, the Church is making no impression! They have learned to laugh at our disputes, and therefore they scorn our exhortations. Would that our belligerent Christians might carefully ponder these timely words of Mr. Kingsley: "If you had seen (as I have) pious parents destroying in their own children's minds all faith, all reverence for holy things, by mixing themselves up in religious controversies, and indulging by their own firesides in fierce denunciations of men no worse than themselves;—if you will watch (as you may) young people taking refuge, some in utter frivolity, saying, 'What am I to believe? When religionists have settled what religion is, it will be time enough for me to think of it; meanwhile, let me eat and drink, for to-morrow I die;'—and others, the children of strong Protestant parents, taking refuge in the apostate Church of Rome, and saying, 'If Englishmen do not know what to believe, Rome does; if I cannot find certainty in Protestantism, I can in Popery;'—if you will consider honestly and earnestly these sad tragedies, you will look on it as a sacred duty to the children whom God has given you, to keep aloof as much as possible from all those points on which Christians differ, and make your children feel, from their earliest years, that there are points, and those the great, vital root points, in which all more or less agree, which many members of the Romish Church have held, and, I doubt not, now hold, as firmly as Protestants,—adoption by one common Father, justification by the Blood of one common Saviour, sanctification by one common Holy Spirit."

We have not room to dwell at length upon the manifold evils which the Church suffers from the prevalence of party strife. The immense loss which it occasions in the working power of the Church, is obvious. There may be a degree of wholesome rivalry, where various parties aim at the same result through different modes; but not when each considers the others as workers of mischief. We do not indeed view it as an evil, that there should be different layers of opinion in

the same Communion,—the law of our being makes this inevitable; and such differences need not at all impair efficiency of action in the body. The perfection of a great machine may require that there should be a multitude of wheels, of different diameters and moving at various rates of speed; but it is another thing when the impulsive force is expended upon *counteracting* movements.

If an unsound principle in ethics or theology is broached, of course it must be resisted, at whatever cost; but what we complain of, is fierce and unbrotherly contention about points of difference, which the Church has virtually pledged herself to tolerate. And these are the very matters which form the basis of existing divisions; if it were not so, each party would be bound to strike directly for the *expulsion* of the opposite party.

This leads us to notice another practical evil, which injures the Church by making it ridiculous; and that is, the excessive importance given to things, in themselves trifling and insignificant. It looks as though we were not very much in earnest as to the great objects for which the Church exists, when questions of posture, and vestments, and furniture, and ornaments, are made prominent. It does not look as though we appreciated the momentous nature of the battle we are to wage, when the tie of a sword-knot is cared for, more than the temper of the blade. It is an awful thing to see parishes divided, Churches emptied, the peace of families disturbed, and confidence in the Ministry shaken, because of the pertinacity with which one party will insist upon the introduction of some obsolete ceremony, some trifling innovation, which, though in itself harmless enough, and perhaps an actual improvement in point of taste and beauty, has, connected with it, such associations as to make it an offense to a large portion of the congregation. And again, on the other side, it is both mournful and amusing, to see the flaming up of holy indignation, the outburst of Protestant feeling, when the Rector ventures to make the Service of the Sanctuary more orderly and impressive, by the removal of vulgar and incongruous usages. One section can pray to edification only before a stone Altar, with embroidered cloths; another prefers to receive the Communion from a mahogany toilet-table, highly polished, and with elaborately carved legs. One can read and preach with proper unction only from a bronze eagle or a simple music-stand; another feels that the pure Gospel can be uttered, only from a spacious enclosure of timber, duly fenced in on the four sides, and furnished like a fashionable drawing-room. One is not happy, unless he can have his sedilia and credence-table and litany desk, and gilded crosses, and double choir and anti-

phonal singing, and a general marching and counter-marching through the services; another takes fright, when the Psalms of David are chanted in good English prose, instead of being doled forth in prosaic poetry, and scents the effluvia of Popery in the sweet fragrance of fresh flowers, blushing in the font on Easter festivals.

The prominence given to matters of this sort, does not help the reputation of the Church, nor does it conduce to our own intellectual or moral elevation. When the mind deals habitually with small things, it gradually contracts itself to the narrow dimensions of the subjects, with which it has to do.

Another of the worst evils resulting from the predominance of party feeling, is, that it blocks the progress of wholesome improvement in the Church. There are some such changes, which almost all allow to be in themselves desirable, and which almost all consider at present impracticable. If anything of this sort is proposed to be done, each party is afraid the other will derive some advantage by it; and so, by common consent, the brakes are applied, and the wheels stand still. And it is singular to see how those who agree in nothing else, instantly join forces to stay action, whenever any improvement or modification in the mechanism of the Church is suggested. If the "Memorial" movement comes to nothing, which is most probable, it will be, not because the wise and far-seeing portion of the Church do not feel that some action in that direction is demanded, but because of the superstitious fears of party. Large and unwieldy Dioceses must remain undivided, because each party is afraid the other side will elect the new Bishop. The Calendar of Lessons cannot be revised, and we must continue to read long extracts from the Levitical Law on the days of solemn Fasting, because one party fears lest, in the revision, the Apocrypha will be struck out; and the other party, that more of the Apocrypha will creep in. We must go on forever, reading as an Exhortation in the Confirmation Office, what was originally a rubric, and often sounds ludicrously inappropriate, lest the new Introduction should lean towards a High Church or a Low Church view of the ordinance. The stiffnecked High Churchman opposes all change, on the ground of consistency; the supple-jointed Low Churchman, who has never been over-scrupulous in rubrical conformity, opposes all change, in order to secure a quasi reputation for sound Churchmanship. One says, nothing can be improved; the other says, let every man modify the Service according to his own convictions of expediency.

But, after all, the grand evil attendant upon a narrow,

oted partisanship, is, its demoralizing influence. The nes which are sometimes exhibited in our Conventions, uld not be likely to convert intelligent infidels to Christian-. The tactics of party may be conducted as adroitly, perps as unscrupulously, as they are in political campaigns. It it times difficult to see any special difference between the estial anger of ecclesiastical disputes, and the profane wrath the world. Under a given excitement, men who preach ry mildly in their own pulpits, will thunder very boisterly in Convention. Neither does the uproar of party tend the cultivation of a scrupulous regard for truth. Slanders e put into circulation, without any very thorough investigan of the ground on which they rest. Devices are adopted, the discomfiture of the enemy, which are not entirely in ordance with the principles of the New Testament. The ergy and Laity, when the waves of party run high, may emble in Council, and afterwards go home, without having en much advanced in the Christian life, by thus coming to-ther.

All this, it might not be expedient to say, except that everydy knows it to be true. And why does the Church, after ving existed for eighteen hundred years, still continue to ibrace so small a fraction of the world's population? Why s there been no *national* conversion to Christianity, for more an ten centuries? If we are to go on, simply repeating the ocesses of the past, torn with the same intestine feuds, magfying mole-hills into mountains, expending our best strength on matters subordinate and incidental, how long will it be fore the earth is brought under the dominion of the Cross? e must return to the Primitive basis of Unity; we must ve a broader vision, a truer charity, a purer zeal; the Church ust reproduce the character, the doctrine, the spirit of Christ ore faithfully, or that day is far distant when the Kingdoms of e world shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of is Son.

Art. II.—PRESCOTT'S HISTORY OF PHILIP THE SECOND.

History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain. By William H. Prescott, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, etc., etc. Vols. I and II. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

To be classed with the brilliant galaxy of writers, by whom the department of History has been of late adorned, argues the possession of no common ability, in addition to varied and extensive acquirements. But to be placed in the front rank of this remarkable cluster is an honor, we believe, generally conceded to be due to the indefatigable student and the graphic delineator of the annals of Spain.

Mr. Prescott unites some of the most important accomplishments in himself of an able historian; untiring patience, well-balanced and impartial judgment, ideal power to reproduce the past, thoroughness, accuracy, discrimination, charity—with a style and manner in unfolding his gifts every way equal to his historic lore. With less of rhetoric than the eloquent Macaulay, he is yet scarcely less captivating, while he is always reliable. With less of philosophy than the learned Hallam, or the thoughtful Arnold, he yet rivets the links of historic connection with a just appreciation of organic relationship. He does not affect to philosophize on the record, or to conduct the story along its hidden channels which underlie the surface; but without such profession he introduces the reader to an inward standpoint, from which he can see for himself what are the bearings, and causes, and consequences of events, which are threaded skillfully together with a due regard to affinity.

Mr. Prescott excels in highly ornamental painting—in presenting a series of magnificent pictures, or tableaus, perhaps, which carry us back into an actual fairy land, gorgeous with the splendors of an oriental pageant. Remarkably happy in the choice of his periods, he has not to draw for poetic embellishment upon the domain of fancy; but he is helped to material out of the subject itself. Fond of looking at history through a panorama of cathedrals and palaces, and fêtes, or through a gallery of art hung with shields and trophies, as the ancient Ninevite, he carves upon the tablet enduring reliefs with his faithful chisel, which speak to the eye with a living power—

while at the same time he accompanies the striking picture with its profounder teachings.

It is a cause of congratulation, in a day when the archives of the fortress of Simancas and other rich repositories of Castilian annals have been thrown open to the public, that so competent an explorer should be raised up to examine them in the person of our distinguished and accomplished countryman. We may be grateful perhaps to a beneficent Providence for carrying out the purposes of a kindly Nature, in inflicting on Mr. Prescott that organic infirmity, which has incidentally shut him up to this department of toil. Notwithstanding the obstacles with which he has had to contend, he has struggled manfully through them; while his very discouragements have acted no doubt by their continual pressure, to stimulate both his moral and intellectual energies. It is not the first time, that an admiring world has been called to render thanks for blinded orbs in its favorites—which, being dulled to the present—have sought the field for their exercise in the past or in the future.

Philip the Second came to the possession of power at a very remarkable period in modern times. The Reformation of religion—already in progress for nearly forty years—was making its impatient way through middle and northern Europe. The Council of Trent was protracting its fitful sessions. One of the proudest monarchs of any age of the world had just abdicated his throne in favor of his royal son, and had retired himself to monastic quiet. Surrounded in his reign with sovereigns of note, who would have shone more conspicuously but for his towering genius—Francis the First and Henry the Eighth, Leo the Tenth, Solyman the Second and Sigismund the First—it was the privilege of Charles to deliver up his kingdom to his lawful heir with the overshadowing glories of an age of princes. The Austrian ruler had wielded his potent sceptre over Naples and Sicily, the Duchy of Milan, Franche Compte and the Netherlands, the vast domain of Germany, and the now united realms of Castile and Aragon. Tunis, Oran and Cape Verde in Africa, with the fair Canaries—the Sunda and Phillippine Islands on the skirts of Asia, with a part of the Moluccas;—in America, the dominions of Peru and Chili, Mexico and parts adjacent, and many other dependencies in the West Indian group acknowledged his kingly sway. Upon this almost boundless empire, stretching itself around the globe, the sun never set. Commensurate with its range were its wealth and vigor, and the never-sleeping ambition of him who ruled it. The silver mines of Potosi and Mexico, and the golden treasure-houses of Peruvian Incas—piled up with bars of massive ore—poured their

rich tribute into its coffers. Its fleet was the most numerous that rode the seas; and its troops of soldiers trained to ceaseless warfare, and led on by generals of a score of battles, were the best in Europe. The power of the Turk had been successfully stayed by them before the walls of Vienna, and rolled back like a billow into the deep. France had been kept by an almost unbroken series of victories from transcending her limits. The war of the peasants had been repressed in Germany. The league of the Protestant princes, until a very recent moment, had been put at defiance. The heterogeneous elements of a vast, unwieldy empire, had been preserved entire, notwithstanding the causes for a total dismemberment, by the twofold chain of commanding wisdom and soldierly prowess.

But when Charles the Fifth actually laid aside his purple, misfortune and reverse had begun to cast their shadows. The last days of his power were marked by a waning glory—by his precipitate flight before the Saxon elector, and the disastrous siege of the city of Metz. It had long been the purpose of this chivalrous monarch to resign both his sword and crown to Philip, as soon as the latter should be able to bear them. The time for this surrender came slowly on. The unsettled strifes which the father was unwilling to bequeath his child, lingered long upon the hands of the weary parent, and put off continually his anxious intent. At length, however, a cessation of hostilities was formally agreed to, by both France and Spain, for five years to come. Like an astute warrior, who sees that there are contests yet to wage—and who, instead of risking any longer by exposure the loss of the head which alone can direct, prefers to look from the securities of a watch-tower upon the struggle that threatens on the field below—he exchanged the activity of camp and court for the retirement of Yuste.

We look upon the abdication of the noble Emperor as neither selfish altogether, nor yet as wholly religious. A mixture of religion was doubtless found in his motives. But in addition to this he felt beyond a question his inability to labor as he had done already—to endure the fatigues of a weary march, or to bear the shock of a battle—and deeming that two heads were better than one, he withdrew to be a counselor, adviser, supporter, while the execution of purposes was left to his heir. In this view of the subject we can hardly fail to be confirmed by the continuance of Charles, after his establishment at Yuste, to interest himself in affairs of state. He was as much a diplomatist in a monastery as he had been in a palace. In constant correspondence with the king and the regents, he was apprised of every occurrence of mishap or success, and participated actively

in meeting its issues. Nothing is more striking than the sort of spiritual ubiquity with which he was able to be present in all parts of the kingdom. He seemed to have changed from a simply bodily actor in a single locality, to a multiplied mental director in every quarter of Europe.

Strange life was that of the uncrowned head of a mighty dominion in the still shades of an Abbey. Fancy draws to us the picture of a cloistered monk shut up in the walls of his contracted cell—the shirt of hair-cloth chafing his skin—a pallet of straw his bed, and continual fastings and vigils his engrossing duty. It paints us an eremite, dead to whatever concerns the world, and wrapt in contemplations of heaven and a better life with God. The devout Romish ascetic would fain have us believe that this is a portraiture of Charles the recluse.

But behold the contrast to this ideal drawing, which the unlying papers in the archives of Simancas have brought lately to view; behold a modest addition to the monastic home, a separate establishment built by Charles himself in the inviting retreat to which he had turned his steps—a retinue of fifty household servants and chosen courtiers forming his family—his principal apartment hung with costly tapestries—the pencil of Titian adorning its walls—rich pillowy chairs on sumptuous carpets indulging his pains—the air without perfumed by odors wafted from orange groves and gardens of citron beneath the windows—the choicest music in the adjoining chapel—eloquence from the lips of Jeronymite monks selected on purpose for the royal pleasure, to refresh his piety and to delight his ear—a daily banquet served on silver platters, such as the stately feasts of an epicurean court could hardly surpass, either for variety or rarity, though medical care on one side of the table stood to condemn imprudence, and religion on the other to rebuke carnal appetite. And instead of the high converse of a stranger to earth and his undisturbed tranquillity—behold a daily sensibility to the deep throbbings of society which beat at the great heart of the world without—which were felt for by the sovereign, and felt too by his majesty as anxiously as by the actors in life's thrilling drama.

Mr. Prescott's digression into an account of the last days of this modern Diocletian, is a most interesting chapter; and though anticipated through the press by the "Cloister Life," by Mr. Sterling, is too valuable a fragment to be thrown aside from his pages. We are glad that the account has been retained by its author, and embodied in the form of a permanent history.

Now while Charles was thus dividing between devotion and

politics, we must not forget that his heir—his single child by Isabella of Portugal—was beginning to wield the fortunes of Europe. Upon the retirement of his father, we have seen that the empire had reached its zenith, and even passed the meridian. Shorn of a portion of the honors of the sovereign before him by the transfer of Germany into the hands of Ferdinand, Philip at first would have been less powerful than his illustrious sire, but for his alliance by marriage with the Queen of England; an alliance by the way which added little to his power beyond the exertion of his personal influence. He was invested with no authority over the realm of his consort, nor even with a title to future succession, except through the issue of their wedded bonds.

It was the ambition of Charles, in addition to a union with the English Queen, to secure to Philip the imperial sceptre, by persuading his brother, the uncle of Philip, to relinquish his claims to the Germanic throne. Had this request been granted, the most extensive kingdom, since the irruption of the northern hordes, would have been placed within the hope of a single chief—and there is no predicting what would have been the consequence. The arms of Spain were already stretched out over the best of Europe. She had brought to her aid by marriage and treaty, and by conquest abroad, such means of strength, that nothing but the rivalry of her Gallican neighbor could check her progress. Yes—there was an additional hindrance to her onward march, which was better than the jealousies of the crown of France. There was a power like the stone cut out of the mountain, which was daily augmenting in its secret places, raising its stern antagonism with a yet bolder front every year and month—which was destined to arrest the career of Philip, and even to despoil him of some of his fairest heritage. The sturdy blows struck by Luther at the Papacy, and through that, at tyrants, had made a kingdom tremble. Already had the princes of the Protestant states forced a monarch to treat. The influence of the movement which was begun in Saxony, was felt beyond the Rhine: it had crossed the Alps, and scaled the Pyrenees, and was even perceptible to the very pillars of Hercules. While ill successes with this on the part of Charles put Philip to disadvantage in attempting to follow him, the difficulties brewing in the condition of Christendom, revolutionary tendencies and causes of war made it exceedingly perilous for the youthful helmsman who was now to undertake to outride the storm.

All the elements of decay, it is very easy to see, were either active or latent in Philip's dominions, before he began to

reign. Nothing but a wise and comprehensive policy could prevent their ferment. A more ill-assorted and unnatural union we can hardly conceive of, than that which existed between Spain and Flanders. Different in temperament, alike as in pursuits and tastes, the one proud and grave—the other joyous, frank, genial, lively; one fond of war—the other of the arts of peace; one closely wedded to its ancient customs—the other progressive, and full of inventive genius; like their country, hemmed in by walls of sea and sierras, the one exclusively and intensely national—the other, like their lowlands, open to all the approaches of surrounding regions, drinking in a catholic and comprehensive spirit; inclining to opposite standards under the Christian name, with no political sympathy, no commercial relations, mutually jealous on account of the changing partialities of their sovereign in common—they could never have cohered if left to themselves, and must inevitably have separated upon the mere removal from them of external bonds of connection and restraint.

To the warmhearted Flemings, Charles the Fifth had been a universal favorite, because he was born in Flanders, and had imbibed their generous and cordial sentiments from his cradle up. All his courtiers were Flemish magnates. Even his attendants in Spain were brought from Flanders—so that the proud Castilians justly took offense at his obvious leanings to their northern rival. Philip, on the contrary, was a native of Spain, and the hauteur and coldness of his peninsular subjects found their complete embodiment in this princely scion. He disgusted the Flemings by his frigid reserve. He offended the nobility, both at Brussels and Westminster, by his supercilious carriage. It was not in his nature to condescend to others. To be affable was a pain to him. To extend common civilities appears to have been forced and irksome service. He moved among men as one born to command, and less by the magic of personal character, than by the authority of superior station. He dwelt within himself;—he had few sympathies with his race. In his cold, icy breast, where a heart ought to have been, he nursed his selfish, sinister intentions—calculating in his marriages, in his contracts, in his government, in everything save his sombre religion.

In respect to kindliness of spirit, Charles appears to us to have caught something of the temper of his unfeeling son, when he went aside to a cloister. He became less noble as he became more secluded; and his bigotry was inflamed to an unwonted degree, just in proportion to his estrangement from society, and the gloominess of his reflections in the solitudes of the mountains.

Now, prejudicing the Lowlands at the very outset of his career by this want of amenity—offending them still more by his arbitrary demands in the use of power—Philip paved the way to a settled and growing dislike, which was ready at any time to break out into an explosion. Still farther than this, braced up as he was in the iron-bound intolerance of a religious inquisitor, he provoked a revolution in one part of his empire, and exanimated another by his fiery persecutions. It has been well said by Mr. Prescott, that the key to Philip's character was his zeal for the Papacy. That he had in addition, as the historian intimates, a love of irresponsible and absolute rule, cannot be questioned for a moment. He was never willing to submit to dictation. No appeal would he tolerate—hardly a respectable conference. He could not abide the Netherlands because of their sentiment of freedom, their corporate rights, and their States General—all of which in time he meant to extinguish. Unlike to Charles, in whom ambition no doubt was the master passion, Philip bowed to the yoke of a more tyrannical frenzy, in the shape of a crusading and deadly hate of the heretic. Charles would not have spared even the pontiff himself, had he stood in his way. He was sincere in his faith, but he was yet more earnest in extending his government. His strife with Protestantism was provoked quite as much by its tendency to political as to ecclesiastical evil; and, when shut up in Estramadura, he perceived how the cause of the Reformed confederates was threatening the integrity of the Germanic States, it was, we believe, even more for this reason, than for all others put together, that he regretted his "safe conduct" to Luther, at Worms. Philip, on the other hand, would rather forfeit his sceptre, than reign over enemies to the Church of Rome. When, contrary to every principle of right and justice, with intrigue and insult added to injury, Pope Paul the Fourth made war on the possessions of Philip in Italy, the latter, though firm in resisting aggression—though he drove back the pontiff, or rather his allies, to the very banks of the Tiber, and might have taken him captive in the seven hilled city—he yet forbore his advantage—stooped to the humiliation of accepting terms from the conquered—asked pardon for intrusion—and even consented through his general to receive words of absolution from the offending prelate, for having lifted up his hand against him. The ex-sovereign, at Yuste, was restless and impatient at this forbearance of Philip with such a lordly rebel; but his successor at Madrid looked through the political disturber in Pope Paul the Fourth, to his spiritual head.

Now the forces of France had been called into this struggle to abet the ends of the rebellious pontiff; and albeit it was at the solicitation of the latter, yet the former were held accountable by the Court of Spain for breaking the solemn covenant of a five years' truce. We behold therefore the armies of the indignant victor marched into the territory of his faithless rival to punish this perfidy. The Duke of Savoy, and Lamoral, Count of Egmont, unite their solid columns on the plains of Picardy, about St. Quentin. The flower of French chivalry is shortly routed before them, and the veteran Montmorency is taken prisoner. The well-guarded fortress, after a gallant defense, is stormed and razed—inflicting a wound upon the proud honor of France such as she had not received "since the battle of Agincourt." As illustrating the character of Philip the Second, we introduce an extract from the pages before us, which very nicely discriminates in one important respect between the father and son.

"When Charles the Fifth received tidings of the victory of St. Quentin, the first thing he asked, as we are told, was, whether Philip were at Paris? Had Charles been in command, he would doubtless have followed up the blow by presenting himself at once before the French capital. But Philip was not of that sanguine temper which overlooks, or at least overleaps, the obstacles in its way. Charles calculated the chances of success: Philip those of failure. Charles' character opened the way to more brilliant achievements, but exposed him also to severer reverses. His enterprising spirit was more favorable to building up a great empire; the cautious temper of Philip was better fitted to preserve it. Philip came in the right time; and his circumspect policy was probably better suited to his position, as well as to his character, than the bolder policy of the Emperor." Vol. I. p. 240.

In less than four months after this memorable triumph, we find the Duke of Guise attacking and capturing the strong hold of Calais. A second descent on the lilies of France is undertaken by Philip; in the progress of which the hired soldiers of Henry, while attempting a retreat along the shores of the Channel, are fallen upon by Egmont and cut effectually to pieces—the guns of an English squadron which was coursing near the banks raking them from the sea.

Both the Spanish and French Monarchs now took the field in person, after this battle of Gravelines. What but prudence and fear—the hazard of losing all on a single throw of the die—kept the latter from advancing, and what but habitual caution put a restraint upon the former? As the historian remarks,

had the fathers of these princes been in the place of their sons they would doubtless have crossed swords before they parted; one or the other would have led his forces to victory. The dauntless Austrian blood would have followed up its opportunity with the impetuosity of lightning. Its vehemence and determination might have outrode its judgment. But the cooler Castilian which flowed in Philip was slow and considerate, calculating the chances of disastrous defeat, fitted for the cabinet rather than the scene of combat—and prone to winding its way in the train of events, rather, than attempting to furrow channels for itself, by shaping circumstances to suit its pleasure. The consequence was, that the two armies were separated, and a treaty was entered into at Cateau Cambresis in the course of the following year.

Still it is not to be concealed that one of the causes of this pacific disposition was the financial embarrassment pressing heavily on the treasuries of both the kingdoms; and a still weightier circumstance, which turned the scale, was the alarming spread of the Protestant religion. Henry the Second was as anxious almost to crush the rising reformation, as was Philip the Second, but he had less of power. France had proved quite a productive soil for the reformed doctrines; but while Catherine de Medici, who soon ruled its destinies, was intent upon furthering her own aggrandizement, and Ferdinand the Emperor across the Rhine pursued, for the most part, a lenient policy, it was reserved to Philip—qualified for the task both by position and character—to stand forth as the champion of the chair of Peter, and to wage unyielding warfare against the heretic. We propose to narrow down our range of discussion to a notice of the history of this extraordinary conflict, in what remains of the present review.

Now to appreciate the sentiment of a bigoted Romanist three centuries since, when he saw the agitation of the pontifical sea caused by the stir of some internal commotion, which threatened to involve it in a general storm, we must remember that that sea was as hallowed in his eyes, as the waves which were once pressed by our Saviour's feet in Galilee—that it reflected to his view all that he knew of Heaven —that there was no religion, as he thought, which had not bathed in its waters—that to purify it from some of the human admixtures which had been thrown into its bosom, might be well, but the attempt must proceed from its own central spring —while to inveigh against that, to charge to its visible head the very abominations deplored and condemned was high-handed impiety against Christ and against God. The ignorant zealot

who saw the agitation of which we have spoken, had no doubt that it proceeded from the very gates of hell, opened up into the vasty deep. And the ambitious ruler who had been used to riding on that sea to power, who had found that in alliance with the papal throne had been his strength, felt called upon not only by his Christian faith, but by despotic principles, to oppose the rising of this seditious movement.

Philip the Second loved absolute principles, but he feared "heresy" more. He had received his birth and education in a land which had stormed with persecuting zeal against the un-Christian for more than eight centuries. Extermination of error was the war cry of the Spaniard, from the first invasion of the Saracen. Christendom owes very much to the indignant rage of the Peninsula against the triumphs of the crescent. In western Europe and in eastern not forgetting the Hungarian struggles she was the staunchest defender of the cross. No one can say what would have been the religion of the continent in the sixteenth century, had the followers of the Prophet been opposed by a less resolute arm or by a power less effective than that of the monarchs of Spain.

Almost crushed in the seventh century, crowded by her invaders into the narrow quarters of Biscay, and Asturia on the north—her Visigoth leaders there rallying their strength, and re-crossing the sierras which had walled them in like a bulwark steadily, though with slow and fluctuating success, recovered her territory—contested at every point with almost resistless valor—until they saw once more the broken ranks of Islam robbed of their usurped dominion, save in the kingdom of Granada. Ferdinand the Catholic and his fair queen of Portugal were not long in reducing this remaining province. When the Church became dominant, both Moslems and Hebrews, partly from fear and sometimes from conviction, flocked in great numbers to the side of the victors—espousing the faith. Defections from time to time took place in their ranks, and secret adherence to the creed of their fathers was practiced by many who hypocritically professed to be converts to Christ. It was at this precise juncture that Isabella and Ferdinand, under the advice of Mendoza, Archbishop of Seville, introduced the Inquisition which for nearly three centuries had existed in Europe with very qualified powers. Now it was brought to bear with all its effective discipline, and all its uncompromising cruelty against apostates. Taking a wider range, it assumed the work of conversion, and became at once a political engine, as well as a religious. This Institution was revived by Pope Paul the Fourth, under Philip the Second. The Spaniards who had

formerly resisted its introduction had become used by degrees to its terrible espionage, from which none were safe; and having gradually lost even the forms of freedom under Charles the Emperor, who had suppressed their Cortes, and being inclined constitutionally no less than by custom to war for the Church, gave it their quiet and cordial countenance.

The advance of the Reformation into the Spanish dominions had been effected for the most part through the soldiers of Charles who had served in the Lowlands, and who carried home to the peninsula something of the doctrines which they had learned of their associates. But it was not the soldiers alone who had imported these novelties. Many scholars of Spain had been educated in Germany, and many savans and courtiers who followed in the train of the warlike emperor had become inoculated with Lutheranism. Men of intelligence and piety upon their return from middle Europe, took pains to disseminate the truths they had received through secret societies. A version of the Bible was printed in Castilian at one of the presses of Germany. Various Protestant publications, some of them originating among the Spaniards themselves, were privately circulated. Particularly in Aragon, which, from its proximity to France, held easy communication with the race of the Huguenots, and in Seville and Valladolid, the principles of the Reformers made considerable progress. And the extent of their diffusion may be judged of from the fact, that when a simultaneous descent, in all parts of the kingdom, was concerted by Valdez and his numerous minions, on the unsuspecting victims of their heartless cruelty, the chambers of the Tribunal, the common prisons, the convents, and even private dwellings forced into the service, were found wholly inadequate to receive the quarry.

No rank, however high, and no class, however tender, were spared the ordeal. Spain's ripest classical scholar of the day, her most eloquent preacher, and her most able historian, were hailed, we are told, with other ornaments of the realm before the awful tribunal. Many pious Dominicans were committed on suspicion; Cazella, the favorite chaplain of Charles, perished in the flames. No less than nine bishops of the Roman Catholic communion were compelled to humiliating penances for heterodoxy in opinion. Bartolomé Carranza, archbishop of Toledo, partly for his moderate and enlightened views of the Church after the school of Contarini, Pole and others, and more particularly for jealousy at his rare success and his large emoluments, was seized by the Grand Inquisitor, worried out by confinement, and after eighteen years of suspense and wrong was respited by

the Pope, only to die of his sufferings. It is not needful to recount the confiscations and banishments, the slow processes of torture, the life-long captivities and mortifying endurances, with which the reconciled to Rome escaped the garotte or the fagot. Nor is it, above all, important to describe the inhuman "autos de fe" with which the proceedings of the Inquisition were solemnly and finally closed. These mockeries of religion are held up by Mr. Prescott to the execration they deserve—who has depicted them to us with the hand of a master.

But what was the effect of this exterminating strife? The cause of the Reformation was plucked up by the roots, and has never since taken effect upon the soil of Spain. A few independent enquirers may have been left in its cloisters, who never dared to avow themselves; and down to this present, it is only here and there that some earnest Dominican or friar of St. Francis calls into question the corruptions of Rome, remaining, however, in his sacred order because there is no other alternative. The memoirs of Blanco White furnish an illustration of the working of this leaven among the ranks of the clergy.

But was the effect of persecution confined to the Church? Did it not extend itself into the department of State, and even to the world of letters? If the reigns of Philip and his father before him were the culminating era in the renown of Spain, the times which followed saw her gradually decline from a commanding eminence to a low political stature among the nations. "The fall of Granada had given the first impulse to her creative genius, and the stirring times of Charles brought out a rapid development." There was the old Castilian, the Provencial admixture, and lastly, the Arabic element—full of chivalry and love of country—which were fused at length into a distinguishingly national and brilliant muse. Shortly after Philip's days the poets became less Spanish; on account of surveillance, writers wrote with caution, save in a few rare exceptions; thought became restrained, enquiry hampered, the range of study contracted, politics and theology were barred subjects to the people, science never throve, and character died slowly out. "Folded under the dark wing of the Inquisition," are the eloquent words of Mr. Prescott, "Spain was shut out from the light which in the sixteenth century broke over the rest of Europe, stimulating the nations to greater enterprise in every department of knowledge. The genius of the people was rebuked, and their spirit quenched under the malignant influence of an eye that never slumbered, of an unseen arm ever raised to strike. How could there be freedom of thought, where there was no freedom

of utterance? Or freedom of utterance, where it was as dangerous to say too little as too much? Freedom cannot go along with fear. Every way the mind of the Spaniard was in fetters. His moral sense was miserably perverted. Men were judged, not by their practice, but by their professions. Creed became a substitute for conduct. Difference of faith made a wider gulf of separation than difference of race, language, or even interest. Spain no longer formed one of the great brotherhood of Christian nations. An immeasurable barrier was raised between that kingdom and the Protestant states of Europe. The early condition of perpetual warfare with the Arabs who overran the country, had led the Spaniards to mingle religion strangely with their politics. The effect continued when the cause had ceased. Their wars with the European nations became religious wars. In fighting England or the Netherlands, they were fighting the enemies of God. Their wars took the character of a perpetual crusade, and were conducted with all the ferocity which fanaticism could inspire.

"The same dark spirit of fanaticism seems to brood over the national literature; even that lighter literature which in other nations is made up of the festive sallies of wit, or the tender expression of sentiment. The greatest geniuses of the nation, the masters of the drama and the ode, while they astonish us by their miracles of invention, show that they have too often kindled their inspiration at the altars of the Inquisition.

"Debarred as he was from freedom of speculation, the domain of science was closed against the Spaniard. Science looks to perpetual change. It turns to the past to gather warning as well as instruction, for the future. Its province is to remove old abuses, to explode old errors, to unfold new truths. Its condition, in short, is that of progress. But in Spain everything not only looked to the past, but rested on the past. Old abuses gathered respect from their antiquity. Reform was innovation, and innovation was a crime. Far from progress, all was stationary. The hand of the Inquisition drew the line which said, 'No further!' This was the limit of human intelligence in Spain. The effect was visible in every department of science—not in the speculative alone, but in the physical and the practical; in the declamatory rant of its theology and ethics, in the childish and chimerical schemes of its political economists. In every walk were to be seen the symptoms of premature decrepitude, as the nation clung to the antiquated system which the march of civilization in other countries had long since effaced. Hence those frantic experiments, so often repeated, in the financial administration of the kingdom,

which made Spain the by-word of the nations, and which ended in the ruin of trade, the prostration of credit, and finally the bankruptcy of the state." Vol. I, pp. 446–8.

From this Sahara of the Papacy, we now turn our attention to the blighted prospects of another part of the heritage which fell to the scepter of Philip the Second. In changing our field of vision from southern to middle Europe, we are to remember that we leave the most romantic and chivalrous of all the lands of song for an intelligent, thrifty, adventurous people, stretching their peaceful enterprise to the most distant countries. Flanders and Holland led the way in productive and useful industry in the Sixteenth Century. Their manufactures were more extensive, their cities more populous, their merchants more successful than any others in Europe, while the comforts of life and even its elegancies were widely distributed. Antwerp was the banking house of all the nations. Education and learning kept pace with wealth. Scarcely an inhabitant was to be found throughout their territory who could not read and write, and this at a period when public systems of education were quite unknown. The people were distinguished for a general love of liberty. The States of the Netherlands were virtually republics, independent and distinct, having their own legislatures, courts of justice and rulers; acknowledging, indeed, a supreme court of appeal in their associate capacity, and a body called the States General, in which they were severally represented; which body, however, had no power to make laws, neither to vote supplies, nor enter into contracts, but only to counsel and recommend to the provinces.

When Philip the Second took the government of the Lowlands, he was not a little annoyed by the free speech and demeanor of his Flemish dependents. He stayed but a short time at Brussels, the seat of his Court, and committed the care of the country to his half sister, Margaret, the Duchess of Parma. She was to be assisted by two Councils, consisting of noblemen, who should concur in her movements; in addition to whom, a select body of three, called "the Consulta," was be to her common resort. Granvelle, bishop of Arras, Viglius, a jurist, and Count Barlaimont, made up the Consulta. Beyond these persons she seldom looked for advice.

The Reformation in Flanders was so identified in its growth with a Civil Revolution, that it is hardly possible to do justice to its progress, without describing its adjunct. The Flemings were ill at ease with the conduct of Philip from the very commencement of his reign; first, because of his appointment of foreign vicegerents to the chief offices under him,

and secondly, for his quartering an army of soldiers upon them in a season of peace. Of the former, perhaps, they had less reason to complain, as it was only a reversing of the course pursued by his father; but with the latter they were more justly offended, because the object was to enforce the sanguinary edicts which had been published by Charles against the Reformed Religion. We shall not stop to show how the seeds of the Reformation had been scattered over the Netherlands, lying on the middle ground as they did between Wittemberg and Geneva, and the Cross of St. Paul. It was impossible that so inquisitive and social a people should have remained insensible to the wide-spread controversy. The doctrines of Luther, and in some measure, of Calvin, had awakened a general interest amongst the population. The Protestant standard found them zealous adherents. The people as a class, that is, the more thoughtful, entered cordially into it. Their affections, their tastes, their convictions, their principles, sided with Protestanism—as those of the Spaniards sided with Papacy. Hence, the edicts of Charles could never be enforced. In some provinces like Brabant, they were never attempted to be executed, while in most, they were suffered to become almost quiescent. But now Philip would revive them. The Inquisition proper he would establish in Flanders, such as he had erected at home; and the people taking fire at the thought, kindled into a flame of active opposition. In connection with this, he sought to introduce fourteen new bishoprics into the territory of the Flemings, to whose support should be diverted the revenues of the abbeys, henceforth to be subjected not to priors but to prelates. The civil dignitaries were displeased, because the already mighty power lodged in the hands of the king would be swollen by this; and the common subjects took offense, because it would assist the Inquisition.

Disregarding however, both the nobles and the people, the king pursued his measures. The consequence was an incipient rebellion. Some of the provinces refused altogether to admit their bishops—all condemned the edicts. William, the Prince of Orange, who had stood high in the favor of Charles the Fifth, and Lamoral, Count of Egmont, the hero of the battle of Gravelines, were members of the Council of State, who protested with their associates against these steps. Their ground was not an ecclesiastical one, for Egmont was a papist, and Orange, at this time, was by no means a protestant. It was simply for the reason that the measures were impolitic. They would foment disorder—they would increase apprehension, which alrealy existed to such a degree as to lead hundreds to

emigrate—thus crippling the resources, and transferring the industry and talent of the people to neighboring countries. The truth is, the Romanists, hardly less than the Reformers, were opposed to the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition. All classes alike were jealous for the liberties of their ancient dominion.

The patriotic leaders preferred now a complaint to their lawful sovereign, that many acts were ratified by the "Consulta" of the realm, without their concurrence, for which they themselves were held responsible by the people. Their opinions, they averred, were so little regarded, that the Regent and her ministers did not wait to receive them. A misunderstanding in consequence sprung up between Granvelle and the order of the nobles. They petition for a calling of the States General together. Forbidden to do this, by direction of the king, Margaret reluctantly accedes to a Convention of the knights of the Golden Fleece—who appoint the Baron Montigny to visit Madrid, and lay before his Majesty the deplorable state of affairs. Montigny accepts his mission. Philip recommends to the Regent to cajole Count Egmont and the Prince of Orange by flattering words; or to divide their councils by exciting mutual jealousy. Granvelle becomes daily more and more the object of general hate. The whole influence of the country is solemnly banded against him, till Margaret at length abandons his cause, and the king acquiesces in his retirement from the cabinet. In the meanwhile, through the conflict of the "Consulta" and the nobles, and the fluctuation of the Regent, the edicts are not put in force, and the cause of the Reformation consequently makes rapid strides onward. Many return from their exile, hoping to escape farther trouble. The officers of justice are openly defied by the people, and prisoners are released by violence who had been condemned to suffer. When the Tridentine Decrees were directed to be published and established in the Netherlands, the Roman Catholic clergy, no less than the laity, objected to the measure as a ruthless invasion of their wonted privileges.

A second deputation from the Council of State is accordingly sent to Madrid, in the person of Egmont, to set forth again existing grievances. The Count is graciously received, and dismissed with promises. His report on his return gives general joy to the people—and to all persons indeed, save to the Prince of Orange, who does not credit his sovereign. Very shortly the worst fears of the Prince of Orange are realized. The procrastinating Philip, ever intent upon his objects, but still disposed to put off their execution—after deceiving the Count,

and deferring the Regent with pledges, announces at Brussels that his edicts must be pressed—that they shall no longer be slighted—and that the persecution of Anabaptists shall be carried on relentlessly. In the very teeth of remonstrances, both from Margaret and the Councils, he refuses to summon the States General together. Sedition becomes rife. The people are ready for war. Placards, lampoons, satirical sallies, are hurled at the throne and the Church. Among the lower ranks of the nobility, a league is formed and entered into, and the famous Compromise is drafted. At the head of this party are Count Louis of Nassau, brother of William of Orange who did not join in the compact, and the more prominent, but less important, Viscount of Brederode. Margaret is smitten with terror. The noble Prince, remarkable up to this time for the temperateness of his policy, and his loyalty to the government, is anxious to bring about a constitutional reform by constitutional measures.

As the fermentation goes on, the malcontents grow stronger, and some of them are for claiming entire liberty in religion, and some even for disseverance from the crown of Spain. A petition is drawn up under the sanction of William, which is addressed to the Regent, and is presented by a deputation of four hundred brave delegates from the celebrated League, who proceed with it in a body to the Court at Brussels. Margaret, at a loss how to understand this petition, thus formidably conveyed, and not a little alarmed, promises to use her influence with her brother of Spain to satisfy their request, and announces that with the advice of the Council of State, and the Knights of the Fleece, she had prepared a scheme for the moderation of the rigor of the imperial edicts. As the confederates withdraw from her presence, led on by Brederode, Barlaimont, with a view to quieting the Regent's fears, observes that "they are nothing but a company of beggars," when the taunt is caught up, and "*Gueux*" henceforth becomes their boasted distinction.

The marquis of Bergen and the baron de Montigny are sent with fresh dispatches from Brussels to Madrid. Margaret's plan of moderation does not satisfy the provinces. The people increase their clamor. In the delay of Philip to reply to the missives, field preaching and street preaching become daily more common under the very eye of the authorities. The ever memorable meeting at St. Trond is held. The confederates again renew their demands in far bolder terms—asking not only redress of grievances, but even for toleration of every form of religion, of whatever shade or name. A few R. C.

members now abandon the League, not being willing to go to this unthoughtof extent. Actual preparations for conflict begin to be made by the insurgents. Margaret writes in imploring terms to her brother to hasten to Flanders, or to convoke the States General, as rebellion is certain. Philip at length makes a reluctant agreement—insincere as it proves, and so avowed in secret even at the time—to abolish the Inquisition, and to extend a general amnesty to all, with one single exception, whom his sister should pardon; it being understood that the League should be abandoned from this day forward. Yet to summon the States General he will not consent—while the conditions are such of his royal allowances, that they fail to conciliate the people, though they trouble his own conscience for their overmuch clemency.

Is it not easy to see that the breach between the king and the inhabitants of the Lowlands, is widening continually? The party of the Reformers, in distinction from the Confederates with whom they were united, gather fresh courage at this time, and push forward to the commission of a series of outrages, which, almost hopelessly, throw back the advancing cause. Iconoclasm from their ranks, breaks boldly into churches and despoils their altars; images, pictures, decorations, architecture, are all wantonly invaded and irretrievably ruined. No resistance is attempted. The civil arm seems powerless. The Regent, in a panic, determines on fleeing from her palace—from which she is dissuaded, yea, forcibly restrained. She again renews her concessions, and her offers of amnesty to the revolting body; on condition of which, the confederates agree to break up their league, and to aid her government in suppressing the disorder. They disband in consequence, and set about their engagement. First, the Prince of Orange restores quiet to Antwerp, of which he was burgrave, by punishing the leaders of sedition, and by conceding to the Protestants—much to the displeasure of Margaret—six of the ancient churches for holding their own services in, while the remainder are restored to their former proprietors. For this he is censured, no less by the Protestants than by the Regent herself, though for a very different reason. Mutual distrust grows up from this day onward, between Margaret and William. The *political* party proceeding through the country, loses the confidence of the people who are in favor of the Reformation; while the Roman Catholic portion becomes estranged from the latter on account of their sacrilege. The Calvinists and the Lutherans are at war too, with one another, for differences of belief, and will not coalesce. Thus the strength of the opposition is temporarily

broken down. Margaret is able to recover her authority, and to tighten the reins of her government. Egmont and Hoorne take their seats again in her cabinet; but Orange is too sagacious to do so. With the returning power of the Regent, fresh rumors from abroad of the terrible designs of Philip, reach the ear of the country, which lead to fresh determinations to resist his oppression. Protestant princes in Germany, and even the Emperor Ferdinand, interest themselves to dissuade Philip from violence. Margaret retracts her concessions to the Protestant teachers, not allowing them to perform their clerical duties. She calls in the aid of military force, and attempts to introduce garrisons into the principal cities for overcoming her enemies. Valenciennes resists, and stoutly closes her gates during a four months' siege. Antwerp is in a ferment, and but for her noble burgrave, would be given over to destruction. The country around rises up in arms, though it soon lays them quietly down again.

Margaret now exacting a new oath of allegiance—unconditional and absolute—Orange refuses to take it, and abandons the kingdom. Louis of Nassau, Hoogstraten, Culemborg and many others, follow his example. Counts Egmont and Hoorne, though the former especially is affectionately warned by the prince, submit to the test, and vainly hope to reinstate themselves by greater zeal for their sovereign.

It would seem now to have been enough for the satisfaction of the king that order was reëstablished, and that the Papal authority was generally acknowledged. But no; the bigoted and revengeful mind of Philip could not be satisfied until he had thoroughly punished the recent malcontents, and had destroyed in the Lowlands the last seeds of the Reformation. Accordingly, he determined to send Alva to the Netherlands as his plenipotentiary. Hard-hearted as was Philip, he was yet exceeded in fierceness, and coldness, and treachery by this iron-mailed warrior. Alva, with an army speedily mustered for the purpose, started on his journey,

"Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer,"

impatient to lay his hand on the necks of the heretics. Passing through the borders of France, he was urged, on his journey, to turn aside for a moment to deal a deathblow at the Calvinists—the growing faction in the neighborhood under Coligni and Conde. But he resists the temptation. Arrived in the Netherlands, he announces his commission to act independently of any local authority. The Regent is justly incensed. Her power is soon superseded; she resigns in disgust, and retires from the kingdom, and Alva takes her command. The Inquisition is set up in all its odiousness and horror. Setting aside the jurisdiction

of the established courts of the realm, the Council of Blood is appointed for the trial of offenders, and crowds of victims are brought daily before it—who without the shadow of a hearing are summarily condemned to loss of life and possessions. So atrocious is the outrage offered to law and equity, that many of the Council resign, and two only of their number, are left to perform its work. Confiscations, banishments, tortures, deaths, are everywhere decreed. William of Orange, in his remote German home, is appealed to by his countrymen to interfere in their behalf. He raises a small army, which advances to the rescue, but which, for want of perfect concert between its two divisions, is cut off and routed. Among the arrests that are made under the civil authority, two of the most important are the oft-named Count Egmont and his associate Hoorne. Never forgiven—notwithstanding their services both before and afterwards—for their concern with the League which had so threatened the government, they are secretly made prisoners, and thrown into a fortress, from which they come forth only to die. The treachery, inhumanity, injustice and violence exercised by Alva, with the countenance of his master upon these unfortunate nobles, exceed our belief. The historian of Philip recounts with a painful fidelity, the incidents of their trial and eventual punishment. The whole narrative, indeed, of the outbreak in the Netherlands, with its causes and apologies, is nowhere more truthfully brought to the view of the reader than in the present publication.

In vain did those knights appeal to the rights of their order as members of the "Toison d'or," to be tried by their peers. In vain did their counsel ask for a delay of the sentence, in order to produce their witnesses. In vain did a judge learned on the bench declare that the whole proceeding was wrong, illegal in form as well as in spirit. To no purpose did the hero of the battle of Gravelines and the siege of St. Quentin, remind his sovereign of the honor he had done him as a soldier in the field—of his loyalty always, even when resisting his edicts—of his soundness as a papist and of his recent activity in suppressing rebellion and reëstablishing order;—he was not to be spared; but for an example to others as well as for retributive justice, he was to expiate his sins by forfeiting his life on the block.

Thus perished Count Egmont, the pride of his countrymen, the chivalrous, generous, magnificent courtier, the warm-hearted civilian, the lover of the Netherlands. Too susceptible to flattery and too much at heart a loyalist, he could not think of utter separation from his king; a Romanist too, and as such, an enemy to reformation, he was jostled often in his place, in attempting to carry out his views as a patriot;—he was tossed

from side to side, till at length the meshes which wer spread for him had entangled his feet, and he could his escape. The cold blooded premeditation with wl and Philip laid their snare in his path, and finally him into it, is one of the blackest pictures of humar ity.

But while Egmont and Hoorne thus suffered in lands, another victim of deception, the Baron De I who, it will be remembered, was the bearer of despat Bergen from the Council of State to Madrid, was ens confined. For month after month he had been pre Philip from returning with his associate to their hon north. De Bergen in the meanwhile died of his suffe Montigny was sacrificed to the spleen of the mona estates were confiscated, as well as those of his frien rich the royal exchequer.

Can we doubt, that the man who would thus deal nobles on mere suspicion of heresy or of countenancin would hesitate for a moment to take the life of his s fate of Don Carlos has formed the subject of romanc many a dark conjecture. It is wrapped still in myst yet, from the light let in upon it by Mr. Prescott thro ip's letters and missives, we can scarcely avoid the p that his death is to be accounted for by his Lowlan thies. He was suspected of heresy and of estrangen his parent. He would hardly have been doomed to d sanity. His was a fate, as we are almost forced to bel Egmont's and Hoorne's, and Montigny's and Berge that of the Prince of Orange yet later, and of Escoved retary.

It is to the honor of Mr. Prescott, that while he pr the details in the conduct of Philip, with their aggra companiments, he yet yields him the chances of a c verdict. The historian is called upon to furnish a c hibition without partisan prejudices or foregone co His impartiality and fairness do him great credit; accuracy of information secure him the confidenc reader.

We should have been glad to notice the probable of Philip upon the Reformation in England, through riage with Mary; but our limits forbid. We cann mark, however, that there was a hand of Providen early severed his connection with the English thr though we are confident that the Anglo Saxon faith, of the inhabitants of Holland and Flanders, would h

strengthened by a conflict with his oppressive rule, yet it would have been doubtless through fires of martyrdom or seas of blood, that it at last prevailed.

In the volumes before us there are passages of great beauty and truth which it would have been well for the reviewer to transfer to his pages for their intrinsic merit.

The account of the abdication of Charles the First, the sad fate of Italy in the sixteenth century, Philip's marriage festivities, the death of Isabella and kindred descriptions, are among the most graphic of the historical pen. The brilliant episode upon the Ottoman struggle and the brave knights of Malta is fraught with the interest of late Crimean despatches. For fulness of research, for selection and arrangement, for variety of subject, for nice analysis of character and thorough discussion of affairs, for picturesqueness, distinctness and vigor of effect—the History of Philip the Second leaves us nothing to desire. We shall look with eagerness for the continuation of its narrative from the gifted hand of its author, through the enterprising house which now offers it to the public. On its fair and beautiful pages the eye rests with pleasure, and on its typographical correctness. We cannot forget, as we here suspend our discussion, that the master-spirit of the Netherlands is looking from his exile, like the mountain eagle from his aerie, across the scene of carnage—moulting the tenets of his religious indifference—and repluming his pinions for a more lofty flight, with the study of Protestantism and the free principles of the Gospel.

Art. III.—THE CHURCH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The Kingdom of Christ, delineated in two Essays, on our Lord's own account of His Person, and of the Nature of His Kingdom, and of the Constitution, Powers, and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by Himself.* By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1843.

2. *The Primary Charge, delivered before the Convention, &c., of South Carolina.* By the Rt. Rev. Thos. F. Davis, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese. Charleston. 1856.

3. *The Church in its Idea, Attributes and Ministry: with a particular reference to the Controversy on the subject between the Romanists and Protestants.* By Edward Arthur Litton, M. A., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London, 1851. 8vo., pp. 707.

Recent discussions within our own branch of the Church, serve at least to show that we are not yet done with a question, which, we hoped, was long since put at rest. For this question does not at all stop in its relations to the Nature, Organization, Ministry, and Sacraments of the Church of Christ. It concerns equally, all the Doctrines of the New Testament, and the very fact of the Inspiration of God's Revealed Word. No man, who has an eye upon the drifting of popular sentiment in England and the United States, can fail to see, to what issues, fearful issues, this whole question finally must come. This method of argumentation has never been more plausibly exhibited than in the work of Archbishop Whately named above; and we have therefore selected that form of the question, for the purpose of examining it in one or two only of its bearings; to which examination we now invite the attention of the reader.

There are two theories regarding the Kingdom of Christ on earth, into which nearly all opinions on the subject may be resolved. The first may be thus stated. Our Redeemer, before His reascension into Heaven, authorized the formation of a society, to be composed of members professing a belief in His Messiahship; He appointed the first officers of the society, and prescribed the mode of admission into membership; furthermore, He promised that whatever rules of organization and

iscipline should be subsequently adopted by the original offi-:ers should be divinely ratified, and cheered them with the as-urance that He would be with them and their successors to he end of the world. The sacred historians of the life of Christ have given us, each of them, a portion of the Charter under which the Christian society was incorporated; and when we have gathered up the fragments that remain, it will run thus. "And I say also unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven. Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever Ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, &c. Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. Peace be unto you; as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you; and when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained. All power is given unto Me in Heaven and on earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto Me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Now two things are observable in this Charter. First, that the clause which confers the right of ruling or governing the society was, in the first instance, given to one individual officer, and afterwards to the Twelve conjointly; from which it is inferred that the decision of the Twelve collectively, was not essential to the validity of every rule or law of the Church, but that as one passage of the Charter required them to preach to every creature, and thus necessitated a separation of the Twelve, the one from the other, so another clause authorized each of them to rule and govern, with sole authority, in that portion of the world which he should evangelize; and hence, again, is inferred the principle of Episcopacy.

Another point worthy of notice is this: that the Charter does not declare how a succession of officers was to be maintained, although the last clause plainly guarantees that succession.

For the mode, then, by which the succession was preserved, we must refer to the acts and writings of the Apostles; and there it is ascertained that the Apostles ordained their own successors, as Titus and Timothy: second, Presbyters in subordination to Apostles; third, Deacons the lowest grade of officers. It is contended for, that the method of perpetuating officers, established by the Apostles, has been strictly preserved in all ages; that the society itself, its Charter and Ministers, still exist, in discipline and faith as the Apostles at the first arranged them, with this exception, that in the Apostolic age, the society comprised all Christians; but in the present day, a portion only of believers is included in the Church. It is urged, also, that Christians not in communion with the Church, are not free from the guilt of schism. This is one view of Christ's Kingdom, and persons who adopt it, believe themselves to be warranted by Scripture and the History of the Church.

The other view of the Nature of Christ's kingdom differs essentially from the foregoing. Our Saviour, it is said, gave this authoritative sanction to the establishment of a Christian community; and consequently to everything included in the idea of a community, viz: Organization, By-Laws, Officers; therefore, that the Ministers of the Church derive their authority not from any commission received by them from Christ, through the medium of the Apostles and their successors, but from the fact, that they are the regularly appointed functionaries of a *Society* organized on Gospel principles; and that every Christian association, which is orthodox in fundamentals, is stamped with the approval of Heaven, and its officers commissioned by Christ, inasmuch as He authorized the formation of a community, and a community *must* have some Officials for its government.

Dr. Whately is the most powerful expositor of this theory in modern times; and in his "Kingdom of Christ" has skillfully urged the strongest arguments that can be pleaded in its favor. We purpose then to make some remarks on those arguments; and shall endeavor to show that they are erroneous in principle, and must lead to extreme perplexity, though they are adduced for the purpose of simplifying our notions of Church Government. In the present day, when the advantages of organization and the formation of societies are so well understood and so extremely popular, any argument by which the theory of Christ's Church could be brought down to the level of human associations, must recommend itself generally, and becomes plausible in proportion as it is based on "common sense principles." It is therefore certainly to combat popular prejudice to attempt

utation of the theory which rests the whole structure of
ch Government, on the fact that our Lord directed the es-
ıhment of a Community, and by so doing, sanctioned all
institutions which belong to the essence of a Community."
ıis theory, again, has much liberality to recommend it. All
ıtian Associations are thereby equalized in privileges, be-
ɔ it is idle to insert a saving clause, such as "orthodox in
ımentals," in order to restrict the Divine ratification of
ıtian societies within some limits. One society will differ
another in estimating the fundamentals of religion, and all
ties are satisfied that they are fundamentally orthodox. It
ın very satisfactory to be able to approve of a system of
pretation which accommodates all the varieties of Christian
ıization, not with one another, but with Christ's intention
ding that organization. But we suspect that, however in
dance with common sense principles the system may be,
ıat it will be utterly impossible to establish it from Scrip-

suming, then, that our Lord's expression to the Apostles,
cting "binding and loosing,"* meant that He gave to them
he succeeding officers of a Christian Church, the power to
regulations for the management of the community, we
ı that He did *not* authorize the community *to organize it*-
Nothing can be clearer than that He promised the Divine
ɔation to that constitution and government only, which the
tles should adopt. Not a word of sanction is given to
or rules made by others. The first twelve officers of the
ch received authority to legislate for the Church: they
ɔgislate and adopt a method of perpetuating legislators and
rs. Let us ascertain what that method was, and we have
Divinely ratified.
here is it to be found?—for found it must be. In the writings
ıcts of the Apostles. It is admitted on all hands that the
ɔfficers of the Church did not derive their position, their
rs, or rights from the community they governed; the
ion now is, did their immediate successors receive *their*
ı and position from the Apostles, or from the community?
is a question that can only be answered from Scripture,
a careful examination of what the Apostles did and said.
when we have satisfied ourselves as to the system pursued
em, then we have a model for our guidance, ratified in
en according to the promise of Christ. We repeat, the
ıunity did not organize itself. Its first officers were ap-

* Essay 2, § 5.

pointed directly by the Almighty, and subsequently were *inspired* in order to legislate for its members. It, therefore, possessed no such inherent rights. Every society, it is true, has an inherent right to officers and laws, but the Christian Society from the very first had no right to create its officers, or make its own laws; the former were appointed by Christ, the latter were enacted by the Holy Ghost, Who inspired the legislators. If a community, which neither elected its own officers nor framed its own by-laws, which did not even appoint the terms of membership, nor the form of admitting members, if such a community can be said to have any inherent rights, on points vital to the community itself, we are at a loss to discover them. Indeed, there seems to be something very unintelligible in speaking of a society's inherent rights. No doubt officers and by-laws, and methods of admitting and expelling members, are all included in *the idea of a society;* and in some sense a society may be said to have inherent rights to those requisites, without which it could not exist; but the question is not, what items go to make up our idea of a society, but what is the mutual relation of those items to each other and to the society? Is the power to make a man a minister of Christ derived from Christ, or does it come from the people? No one denies that officers, and ships, and articles of war are involved in our idea of a Navy; but, it will altogether depend on circumstances whether the officers' authority proceeds from the commission given them by an absolute monarch, or whether their title be based on the recognition bestowed on them by their crews. In short, few will deny that the SAVIOUR sanctioned the formation of a community, and in so doing sanctioned a mode of government, its officers and laws; but there still remains the question whether *He intended* that His ministers should receive their commission mediately through the community, or immediately from Himself. A king may authorize the embodying of a regiment, and all men may be satisfied that such a command emanated from the king, but still there may be great room for difference of opinion as to the mode of officering it, intended by the king.

This illustration may be expanded, and help us to come to a more complete realization of Christ's Church than we could otherwise arrive at, at least so far as its organization is concerned. Let us suppose, then, that a certain king chose twelve of his subjects, and commissioned them to raise an army of volunteers, the commission empowering the twelve to appoint and commission the officers of the several regiments, and authorizing them to fill up any vacancies that might occur in their own body, and to make any addition to their own num-

bers that circumstances might render necessary, the king's commission extending equally to those whom the twelve appointed as to the twelve themselves. These men repaired to twelve separate districts, for the purpose of recruiting, and the result was that a number of regiments were embodied and officered, forming an army, organized by the original twelve, under the guidance of the king. In process of time, some of the soldiers of several regiments, dissatisfied with the drill and discipline of their officers, deserted, and appointed some of their comrades out of the ranks to be their officers, while they at the same time, loudly disclaimed any intention of rebelling against the king or deserting the common cause; they, however, remonstrated and urged the following plea in justification of their military schism. "Our king authorized the formation of a community called an army, and when he issued his commission he must have known that the idea of officers is inherent in a community, and, *therefore*, since we have rejected our first officers we have elected others in their room." To this it was replied, by the regiments that continued loyal, that the mutineers were evading the whole accusation against them; the question not being whether they were entitled to officers, but who had the power to appoint and commission them.

The mutineers of another regiment pleaded in extenuation of their conduct, "that not only did their original officers render the service insupportable from excessive drill and parade, but that they were endeavoring to infuse into the ranks disloyalty to their sovereign, and were striving to persuade the soldiery to transfer their allegiance *to a certain ambitious Colonel*, who aspired to the office of Commander-in-Chief." To these it was replied by the royalists, "Send up petitions to your king who, if his promises are to be trusted, will relieve you from the grievous treatment you are undergoing, and send you better officers." To this they at once acceded, but the king from wise policy, or to test their loyalty, did not immediately answer their petitions, while the tyranny of the officers became daily more insupportable. The Anglican regiment, therefore, under the guidance of some of their officers who sympathized with their sufferings, set their tyrants aside, reformed their discipline, and under the guidance of the few faithful leaders left, preserved their loyalty untainted. The Irish regiment was warned by this example; the officers, with one or two exceptions, reformed their discipline and returned to their allegiance, and renounced any attachment to the ambitious and designing Colonel. Other regiments, such as the Scottish, totally discarded all the king's officers, nominated others in their stead, and at last engaged in

a civil war with their prince on the subject. One of the loyal regiments also met with a grievous mishap; on a voyage to a foreign country they were wrecked and lost all their officers, while the surviving soldiers were thrown on a desert island. In self-preservation some non-commissioned officers were unanimously elected to command the remnant of the regiment; thus they continued for some time, until their king having heard of their distressed situation, sent them some commissioned officers, and bestowed commissions on some of the gallant men, who from the force of circumstances assumed a temporary command, and thus were they led into a place of safety.

It is hardly necessary to say as a key to this metaphor, that Christ is the King; the Officers the Ministerial successors of the Twelve; the Army, the Church; and as the several regiments, in whatever portion of the globe quartered, have one King, one System of Government, and one uniform, and the possession of these constitute them (say) the British army, so the different Christian communities which are linked together either in one hemisphere or the other, by the possession of ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM, constitute THE CHURCH MILITANT, OR THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

From the foregoing remarks, it will be seen, that we argue against the hypothesis that the Church of Christ possesses any inherent rights, in the same sense that human communities may be said to possess them. Almost all the rights conferred on the Christian Society were derived from a source extraneous to itself. They did not originate in it, but were bestowed on it by Christ through the medium of His Apostles. What those rights were, and what was the method of exercising them, we must ascertain from the Scriptures; because we are assured that the mode of organization adopted by the Apostles, and *that only*, was or is Divinely ratified, according to the promise: "whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven." Indeed, Church officers *could* not have derived their rights from the fact of the Church considered as a community recognizing them as functionaries; for certainly the Apostles did not derive their status from the society of Disciples. They received it direct from their Lord. Again, those Elders whom they ordained in every city, and those Superintendents whom they appointed over every Church, clearly derived their powers from the Apostles. Whatever may have been the manner of electing or nominating persons to be created Bishops in the Primitive Church—and that question we do not here discuss—yet the conferring of the Ministerial Gifts was done only by those whom Christ Himself appointed, and to whom He gave power

o be exercised and transmitted for this very end. So that the Christian Ministry is Christ's special gift to the Church, and is not the gift of, or an emanation from the people; which in its idea is an absurdity, and in fact, is contradicted by the plainest testimony of Holy Scripture. Now if Timothy and Titus received their Commission from St. Paul, and in no way based heir ministerial authority on their recognition by the Churches it Ephesus or Crete, what reason have we to suppose that the Ministry ordained by them did not succeed to the same rights? At what stage in the history of the Church was the claim to Ministerial authority *first* based on the rights of a community, and not on the clear sanction given to the Apostles to ordain their successors? We shall find it very difficult to fix on any time when such a transfer could have taken place; the idea could never have been broached, until a supposed necessity arising from the strange circumstances in which a Christian body found itself placed, rendered some such theory necessary to justify the appointment of Officers in the Church of Christ by the Laity. Should it be urged that the promise of Divine ratification of their legislative acts was made to the Apostles, not as the *Ministry* but as the *members* of the Church; it may fairly be replied, that inasmuch as the promise "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c., was made to St. Peter individually, and to the Twelve collectively, *and since the words on each occasion must mean the same*, we are driven to the alternative of believing, either that the enactments of every individual Church member were to be divinely sanctioned, (an absurdity,) or that the promise was given to the Apostles as the Officers of the Church.

Dr. Whately dwells at length on the scantiness of detail in Scripture concerning formularies and rules, and he infers from that scantiness, that in such matters the Church was to use its own discretion; and since the accounts of the ordination of the higher officers of the Church are very scanty and incidental, therefore they are to be considered as of little moment in regulating our practice. He says,* "For we may plainly infer from this very circumstance, the design of the Holy Ghost, that those details concerning which no precise directions accompanied with strict injunctions, are to be found in Scripture, were meant to be left to the regulation of each Church, in every age and country." Now it does seem to be a very false inference, to estimate the importance of the several topics introduced, in proportion to the diffuseness of the writer. True

* Essay 2d, Sec. 8.

it is, that men generally dwell more earnestly on those subjects which interest them, and which they deem most essential, and no doubt this rule applies to the writers of the Scriptures; but there is great danger in drawing the inference that the subjects which appear to have interested the Apostles and Evangelists, and upon which they consequently dwelt most diffusely, must for that reason be *more inspired* than those subjects which they notice briefly but decidedly.

To admit that doctrines and rules of discipline are deserving of our attention according to their prominence in Scripture, is equivalent to saying that there are degrees of inspiration, and that the writers were more or less influenced by the Holy Spirit, a position that involves us in perplexity and doubt. That the Holy Spirit, speaking by the Apostles, has selected some points for more special injunction and illustration, cannot be denied, but the cause is apparent; some doctrines required more explanation than others; some were more directly opposed to human nature than others; some were specially required by one Church, some by another; one Apostle has chosen one of these for his theme, another has made choice of a different one; but all this diversity does not arise from different degrees of importance being attached to each according to a graduated scale of inspiration. St. James, probably, would not have written as he has done about good works, had not another Apostle written in equally strong language on the subject of Faith; and therefore, it is more reasonable to attribute the difference in the earnestness and prolixity with which Scriptural topics are inculcated, to the fact that it was the misinterpretation and perversion of one Apostle's writings, which led to the correction of them by another, or by the same Apostle; and he would naturally dwell more fully on the subject presented, than on any other which he might bring forward at the same time. Who would infer from reading the "Directory of Public Worship," that the Westminster Divines intended to allow a greater latitude in the observance of the Sabbath, than in the form of prayer? And yet the detailed directions concerning the Sanctification of the Sabbath are brief, compared with those which relate to the prayers; and would it not be more reasonable to conclude that the reason of the difference in detail was, that some matters are *in themselves* more capable of receiving explanation and minute treatment, and others from a variety of causes more in need of explicit interpretation?

Archbishop Whately strengthens his inference from scantiness of detail, by observing,* "That the matters concerning

* Essay 2d, Sec. 11.

ıich the Apostle Paul's Epistles do contain the most detailed ·ections, are most of them precisely those which every one rceives to have relation only to the times in which he wrote; ch as the eating or abstaining from 'meats offered to idols,' d the use or abuse of supernatural gifts; he was left, it should em *unrestrained* in recording, and hence he does record, rticular directions in *those cases where there was no danger* of ose his directions being applied to *all* ages and countries, as nding on *every* Church *for ever.*"

Now, if this be a fair statement, to what straits will the read- s of Scripture be reduced! First, we are told that no de- ils concerning Christian Communities, which are not accom- anied with strict injunctions, are to be considered binding, but re left to the discretion of each Church; and, secondly, that ost of the details which do occur, and which *are* accompanied ith injunctions, are not now binding, but related to Apostolic imes only. Whether, therefore, we meet with details or not, s of little consequence, because when they occur unaccom- panied with strict injunctions they are not binding, and when they occur accompanied with strict injunctions they refer to other times than our own. Must not we then conclude, that only the general principles of the New Testament are inspired, and that a considerable portion of the balance, which is devoted to particularities both in history and precept, is but calculated to set us astray, the minute details which are specified being valueless, because they are either unaccompanied with injunc- tions for their perpetual observance, or because they are obso- lete? Can we for a moment suppose that the Holy Spirit ever intended to throw such a stumbling block in the path of Christ- ians, as to inspire the Apostles, and to teach us that He did so inspire them, and yet allow them so to intermingle truths of eternal obligation with details of no moment, that it would re- quire more than ordinary ingenuity to attempt even to distin- guish them? Is it to be supposed that He, knowing the ten- dency of human nature to attach undue importance to trifles, would insert worthless particularities among solemn generali- ties, and allow them to be received in the Canon of Scripture?

Again; would the Holy Spirit further tempt us to attach due weight to details, by suffering St. Paul to tell us explicitly, when he was speaking *not* "by commandment," and so com- pel us to infer that everything was important, save what was expressly excepted? Should not the fact that St. Paul declared that there were some things about which he would not write, but would "set them in order when he came," induce us to consider those directions he has given as binding on all Christ-

ians, for this very reason that *they were committed to writing at all?* We are then forced to believe that so far from scantiness of detail implying that the matters referred to, were in their nature indifferent, the topics into the details of which the Apostles thought it necessary to enter, were such, that uninspired men could not readily arrange the execution of them, or carry out their minutiæ judiciously.

But it is time to ask, is it true "that the matters concerning which the Apostle Paul's Epistles do contain the most detailed directions, are most of them precisely those which every one perceives to have relation to the times only in which he wrote?" We believe the fact is precisely the reverse. Most of the matters into the details of which the Apostle enters relate to our own times, as well as to the Apostle's days. The two specified by Dr. Whately are not exceptions to this rule, since the Apostle does not descend into details respecting the "eating of things offered to idols," and the abuse of supernatural gifts. He merely answers a question that had been put to him by the Corinthians, regarding the former topic, and decides it on the general principle, "lest I make my brother to offend." Compared with other questions, the details of this point are very brief indeed, nor even though they were much more diffuse could they be said to have relation to Apostolic times only, the Apostle's observations being still valuable and pertinent in all those heathen countries, where Christian Missionaries are laboring.

The other question, viz, the use of supernatural gifts, is more diffusely treated of, but it is an erroneous idea to suppose that the Apostle's detailed observations regarding it were applicable to his days only; true, some of those spiritual gifts, such as prophecy, miracles, and the speaking with tongues, were confined to that age, but then the Apostle treats of the *use* of them *no further* than was necessary to establish for the information of the Church for ever, these two positions; first, the compatibility of a diversity of gifts in the several members of the Church with the absence of schism; and, secondly, the super-excellence of Charity beyond all spiritual gifts; two decisions which we must admit to have universal application in all ages and countries. The *abuse* of these gifts he censures at length, going into detail and giving directions which are as important at this day, as when they were penned; viz, regarding the celebration of public worship in an unknown tongue, and forbidding women to speak in the Church.

We must demur to another assertion of Dr. Whately. "The apostle," he says, "was left *unrestrained* in recording, and hence he does record particular directions in those *cases where there*

s *no danger* of their being applied to all ages and countries." ithout again dwelling on the fact that there must of necessity always some danger of any details that occurred in the *Word God* being superstitiously applied, we would proceed to ob-ve, that it would have been more reasonable to speak of the rinthians being restrained from asking, than the Apostle being trained from answering in matters of detail; for it should be membered that St. Paul, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, which he dwells most minutely on Ecclesiastical affairs, had t the selection of his own subjects. We have every reason to lieve that the Apostle's decisions were regulated by the diffi-lties submitted to his judgment, and that if he omitted to reply all those points, he yet selected the most important and urgent ems and deferred the settlement of the remainder "till he came." t. Paul was then limited to those subjects on which he was onsulted, his determination of which are binding on, and appli-able to every age of the Church, as will be seen by glancing t the various points on which he gives sentence. His decisions especting marriage and celibacy are justly deemed applicable in he present day; his particular injunctions regarding the absurd ustom of Christians nicknaming themselves after divers Min-sters of the Church, are by no means obsolete; his directions o decide disputes by arbitration, to celebrate the Communion vith reverence, unanimity and temperance, his opinion regard-ng women worshiping with the head covered, and the excom-nunication of incestuous persons, the right of those who preach he Gospel, to live of the Gospel; these &c., are all as necessary or a Christian Community in the present as in the Apostolic age. Experience shows the permanent applicability of these directions, nd we might have concluded so, a priori, because the questions vhich the Apostle authoritatively determines originated in buses which were not confined to any one Nation or Church, but vhich are incident to *human nature.*

We have dwelt at some length on this subject, because it is ighly necessary to show the universal applicability of those "exatæ quæstiones" decided by St. Paul. Were it once admitted hat the nature of the several cases limited them to the Apostles' imes, we should have to acknowledge that a considerable por-ion of the New Testament had a divine authority to the cotem-poraries only of the Apostles; we should also be involved in nfinite perplexity in determining what were principles and what details—a most difficult task, since it is by generalizing de-ails that we for the most part arrive at principles; thus it is nly by examination of the particular qualifications for the office of Priests and Deacons, (which are clearly but details,) that we

arrive at the general principle of the Gospel which forbids polyg amy.

But the fact that the Apostle did not *intend* to allow eac Church a discretionary power in applying general principle seems almost certain from other considerations. It is impos sible to peruse his writings without observing the anxiety h evinces for *uniformity* in doctrine and discipline in the sever Churches. Now there is a positive incompatibility between uni formity in practice, and a permission to each Church to use it own discretion in carrying out the general principles laid dow by the Apostles. That St. Paul was in the *habit* of inculcatin uniformity is evident from the fact that he sent* Timothy t the Corinthian Church, "To bring you into remembrance of m ways which be in Christ, *as I teach everywhere in every Church.* To the same Church he recommends a mode of making col lections on the "first day of the week," and he incidentally men tions that he had given the Galatians a similar command When he gives judgment concerning the covering of the hea in public worship, he silences all caviling by declaring† tha "neither have we (that is, the Church at Ephesus, whence he wrote) such custom, neither the Churches of God." When de ciding on the course to be pursued by a believer who was mar ried to an infidel, he adds, "and so ordain I in all Churches."‡ Again, that his Epistles were not exclusively applicable to the particular Church to which he happened to be writing, is evident from his recommending the Laodiceans and Colossians to inter change Epistles, and from these considerations we infer that he *habitually taught the necessity of uniformity.*

This probability is further strengthened, when we consider the importance which St. Paul attached to the observance of those ordinances which he once prescribed; for it is but reasonable to suppose that any practice which he valued highly, he would universally recommend. Hear him addressing the Corinthians:§ "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." To the Thessalonians he says,‖ "therefore stand fast, and hold the traditions ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle." Now all these texts go to prove that St. Paul attached great weight to the uniform performance of certain practices and formularies; the importance attached to them makes it extremely probable, (and when combined with some positive assertions that we have, absolutely certain,) that uniformity would be aimed at, and established. But there is no conceiv able reason why St. Paul should not have wished to perpetuate this uniformity; there was nothing in his own times which ren

* 1 Cor. iv, 17. † 1 Cor. xi, 16. ‡ 1 Cor. vii, 17. § 1 Cor. xi, 2. ‖ 2 Thes. ii, 1

ıore desirable than at other times; we are therefore
y led to the conclusion that his precise directions were
for the Church at all times, since uniformity in Church
would have been absolutely impossible, were it his
to leave each community a discretionary power in
:he general principles he laid down.

we accept this view of the Apostle's intention, it will
lifficult to account for any *details having been com-*
writing at all. On the supposition that the Apostle
ler the guidance of the Holy Spirit, what object was
ıed by his committing to writing a large mass of details
re to be exclusively applicable to his own age only?
's could not carry greater weight than his sermons
orally. Some false teachers, indeed, had sneeringly
l his writings and his words; but St. Paul declared,
h as we are in word when we are absent, such will we be
ed when we are present," and it is not easy to con-
r an Apostle, capable of performing signs and wonders,
ı any end more effectually by writing than by person-
ating Ecclesiastical affairs. Why then did the Holy
mpt these written directions about details? Why select
writing and others for arrangement by the Apostle in
The Holy Spirit must have designed to perpetuate
g which he suggested to the Apostle as fit material for
ecision or allusion; regulations for the management of
which is destined to last till the end of time, must have
nded to suit all times.

ght naturally expect that the Bible would be a practi-
ıtion, but the very reverse would be the case, did it
principles only, or did the detailed cases or rules to be
t refer exclusively to the age in which they were writ-
ı, indeed, there would be some reason in the asserted ne-
r an infallible expositor. This would be the very ground
anist to occupy, for if the Bible were like a Statute-book,
ş the general principles of law only, there is at once
professional body to interpret and apply them to spe-
ı, and a court of final appeal to decide on the interpre-
Could we suppose the Scriptures curtailed so as to
ıthing but narrative and general principles, the volume
d would be infinitely more difficult of comprehension
resent—since the details which appear in it render the
rinciples more easily understood—like the examples
ow the rules of arithmetic. The parable of the good
ı is an exemplification of a general rule, and we readily
t explains that rule practically; as no doubt had the

general principle of "loving thy neighbor as thyself," been given *without* a detailed example, there would be multitudes to ask in every age, "and who is my neighbor?" Thus it appears that an additional objection to the theory of Dr. Whately is supplied by the consideration, that both the imperfection of language in expressing principles and the incapacity of the human mind to develop them, make it very probable that the Holy Spirit would adapt his revelation to the infirmity of our nature, by divesting it of all needless difficulty.

But, however the Sacred Epistles may be regarded, so far as details are concerned, the Historic portion of the Bible can on no theory of inspiration be reconciled with the assumption, that "those details concerning which no precise directions, accompanied with strict injunctions, occur in Scripture, were meant to be left to the regulation of each Church in each age and country." It may be well to premise that the precise directions and injunctions, required in this assumption as necessary in order to render any Scriptural detail universally obligatory, must be given in general terms to all Christians; because if the meaning be that there must be precise directions from the sacred writers *to their correspondents*, we have all that we contend for admitted. Thus on Dr. Whately's theory it is by no means obligatory to have Presbyters as officers in a Church, because we have no injunctions to that effect given to the Christian body at large. True it is, that Timothy and Titus may have received directions to that end, but there is no such command as this, let every Church be ruled by Elders for ever. Again, the mass of the Christian world believe that the sacred penmen inculcated and wished to perpetuate the worship of the Holy Ghost, the duty of fasting, infant baptism, and the practice of monogamy, yet their writings contain no such explicit injunctions as Dr. Whately's theory requires.

There seems to be more point than is generally imagined in the fact, that the Christian Revelation consists of History as much as epistolary correspondence, that God has spoken to us not only in the writings, but in *the acts* of the Apostles. One obvious result of this arrangement is the strength of evidence derivable from a comparison of the two, and the mutual corroboration afforded—such as the Horæ Paulinæ so powerfully deduces—but we may draw another inference from the method devised by the Holy Spirit, viz, that He intended the Church to be instructed by example as well as precept, and that in all times she should model herself according to the illustration afforded by the Historic account of the primitive Church. If this inference be false, the inspiration of the Historians of the New Testament

comes unintelligible; for what do we mean when we assert at St. Luke was inspired? Not merely that his narrative as strictly true, because then we should have a greater number of inspired historians than any one will be disposed to recognize. Gamaliel, or some of the many who had taken the history in hand, might possibly have written an account of Christ and his Apostles, strictly true so far as it went, while at the same time they might have been not only uninspired, but unbelieving.

That the facts, again, related were many of them supernatural, gives St. Luke no title to be considered inspired; neither can he claim inspiration on the ground that his materials were revealed to him, since he tells us that they were derived from eye-witnesses of the facts. In what then consisted the inspiration? Clearly in this and nothing else, that the Holy Spirit exercised such a supervision over his writings, as to compel him—whether aware of the compulsion or not—to *select* such anecdotes, conversations and precepts, as should contain a declaration of God's will on those subjects to which they related, and which were of the *highest* importance. The "diversity of times and men's manners" is indeed such, that many are tempted to believe in the axiom, that most of the minutiæ recorded were meant to be limited to the times in which they were written, but on careful examination we shall find that all such minute regulations were intended to be of perpetual force, unless expressly limited to the primitive Church by the terms in which they were given. There is not a rule for the guidance of personal conduct or for the management of Ecclesiastical affairs, which a Christian of the present day ought not to be bound by and observe, should he find himself situated in circumstances similar to those which originated the rule. Even the community of goods which existed among the primitive Christians ought undoubtedly to be imitated, should similar circumstances warrant the procedure. Self-preservation, probably, at first caused this self-denying liberality, when all dealings ceased between Jews and Christians, and should an attempt be made to evangelize a heathen city in the present day, it would be incumbent on the converted citizens to adopt a similar measure. And as we know that this inter-community of goods did not obtain universally in the Apostolic age, but was left optional, so in a city or nation wholly Christian, this primitive precedent need not be followed.

Again, the Apostolic decree concerning fornication, pollutions of idols, and blood—which at first sight appear an instance of a rule recorded by the Holy Ghost, and yet, now obsolete—when

examined carefully, ceases to be a difficulty. So much of the decree as relates to fornication and idolatry is clearly obligatory for ever. The only objection arises from the mention of blood. Yet when we remember that the observance of this decree was limited expressly to the Gentile Converts in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, *because* the numbers of Jewish residents in those places, who were accustomed to hear "Moses read every Sabbath day," made it expedient that their scruples should be respected; we necessarily conclude that abstinence from blood is still enjoined, *only* when there is such a number of Jewish Converts so zealous for the Law, as to feel offended if their Gentile brethren transgressed in this matter. Such a case may not often occur, though we see nothing to prevent such an emergency arising in the present day in Jerusalem, should the attempt to establish a Christian Bishopric in that city prove successful in making many proselytes from Judaism. But if this be not the true interpretation of the decree, we ask, in what consisted the inspiration of St. Luke, when he penned his account of it?

But let us now regard the details of Church Government that occur in Scripture, in another point of view. On the supposition that the Divine Spirit would interfere *at all* in the organization of the Visible Church, what is the mode of interference which analogy would lead us to expect? Is it not supposable and probable that the positive institutions of Christianity would be prescribed in the same way as the fundamental precepts of religion?" What then was that method devised by the Holy Ghost? We reply in the words of Dr. Whately: "The fundamental doctrines and the great moral principles of the Gospel are there taught—for wise reasons no doubt, and which I think we may in part perceive—not in Creeds or other regular formularies, but incidentally, irregularly, and often by oblique allusions; less striking, indeed, at first sight than distinct enunciations and enactments, but often even the more decisive and satisfactory from that very circumstance, because the Apostles frequently allude to some truth as not only essential, but indisputably admitted, and familiarly *known to be* essential by those they were addressing."* This is a fair statement of the method employed by the Sacred writers in delivering to us essential doctrines; and there seems to be no pretext why we should not apply the same reasoning to those rules for Church regulation which are delivered to us in the same manner, especially when we can see how the method adopted in each case may subserve the same moral purpose.

* Essay 2, Sec. 16.

Dr. Whately will not, however, admit this inference, since he says, "That those points which are either wholly passed over in silence, (when they are such that we are certain from the nature of the case, the Apostles must have given some directions concerning them,) or are slightly mentioned, imperfectly described, and incidentally alluded to, must belong to the class of things either altogether indifferent, or so far non-essential in their character that "it is not necessary (as our 34th article expresses it) that they should be in all places one and utterly alike." Now why should we argue from the oblique and incidental manner of alluding to doctrines, that their importance was the more decisive and satisfactory, and yet deny the same reasoning to hold good in the case of discipline or ceremony? Few indeed will be disposed to deny, "that those points which are wholly passed over in silence must belong to the class of things altogether indifferent," but "that those points which are slightly mentioned, imperfectly described, and incidentally alluded to," belong to the same class of things indifferent, we have good reason to doubt. No one could assert that slight mention or incidental allusion to doctrinal points proves them altogether indifferent; on the contrary, as Dr. Whately judiciously observes, this mode of referring to doctrines is the more decisive and satisfactory. What then is the probability against items of Church government being revealed in the same satisfactory manner? Is it not highly probable that we shall find a close analogy between the manner in which doctrines and moral principles are announced, and the manner in which rules for the organization of the Church—which was to perpetuate those doctrines—are intimated to mankind? The most mysterious doctrines and peculiarities of the Christian religion are not given in the Scriptures in such a way as to appear convincingly plain to its readers, or so as to bring overwhelming conviction to a common understanding; on the contrary, they are arrived at inferentially, by a series of deductions, and a process of reasoning. To gain therefore a knowledge of the plan of Salvation, as comprised in the teaching of the New Testament, requires diligent investigation, and the process becomes a test of a virtuous or vicious exercise of the intellect. Why, we again repeat, may not rules of discipline, by the scantiness or deficiency in detail, serve the same end by testing honesty of enquiry? What reason can be plausibly assigned why articles of Faith confessedly fundamental should have been given to the world, not in regular formularies, but in oblique allusions, and yet rules or suggestions for government be treated as things indifferent, though given precisely in the same manner?

In order to make this point as clear as possible, we will give in Dr. W's own language, the apparent reasons for the method adopted for the transmission of the great doctrines of the Gospel, premising, that while we fully concur in his view on the subject, we can see no ground for not applying the same reasoning exactly to the Ecclesiastical allusions in Scripture. In fact, if the words "Church government" be substituted for the words "Gospel truths," in the following passage, the force of the argument is in no wise diminished.

"Suppose such a summary of Gospel truths had been drawn up, and could have been contrived with such exquisite skill as to be sufficient and well adapted for all, of every age and country, what would have been the probable result? It would have commanded the unhesitating assent of all Christians, who would with deep veneration have stored up the very words of it in their memory, without any need of laboriously searching the rest of the Scriptures, to ascertain its agreement with them; which is what we do, (at least are evidently called on to do,) with a human exposition of the Faith; and the absence of the labor, together with the tranquil security as to the correctness of their belief which would have been thus generated, would have ended in a careless and contented apathy. There would have been no room for doubt, no call for vigilant attention in the investigation of truth, none of that effort of mind which is now requisite in comparing one passage with another, and collecting instruction from the scattered, oblique and incidental references to various doctrines in the existing Scriptures; and in consequence, none of that excitement of the best feelings and that improvement of the heart, which are the natural and doubtless the designed result of an humble, diligent and sincere study of the Christian Scriptures."*

The above quotation expressively supplies a reason for the omission of such a compendium of Christian Faith as would have superseded investigation, and we think that the argument is capable of fair extension to the rules of Church discipline; at least we can see no cause for assuming that the *designed* difficulty of ascertaining the certainty of Evangelical truth, affords a more available field for the moral discipline of the understanding, than the similar difficulty of arriving at a certainty regarding Apostolic order. Both proceeded from the same source, both are revealed in the same style of writing, have been perpetuated by the same instrument, and may in an important respect have served the same moral purpose; we should therefore hesitate long before we ventured to affirm, that one of them belonged to a class of things "altogether indifferent."

Archbishop Whately instances the account given by St. Luke of the institution of the Diaconate, as furnishing an instance of incidental narrrative; and he argues that consequently it is not to be regarded as written for the purpose of

* Essay, p. 34.

supplying any hints for Church government, but merely as an introduction to two great events which were caused by the martyrdom of one of the Deacons, and the preaching of another, viz, the great persecution and the conversion of Samaria. Now, without recurring to the question, in what consisted the inspiration of St. Luke, when he penned an account of the Diaconate—if it be *mere* history—let us examine whether the narrative does really deserve to be called incidental, or more properly accidental; premising, that even though it should prove to be such, still it ought to be regarded as an expression of the will of God, that the Church should ever imitate the Apostolic example, for two reasons. First, because practical truths (as Dr. W. says of Christian doctrine) are taught in the sacred writings, not in formularies, but incidentally and irregularly, and often the more decisively for that very circumstance. And secondly, because no argument can be based on the fact of the Institution *appearing to us* incidental, inasmuch as St. Luke was not so artistic a writer as to take the unnecessary trouble to introduce his events in regular and natural order;—his style being extremely abrupt, and introductions being for the most part dispensed with. This will appear to any one who reflects on the way in which he plunges "in medias res," his most frequent method being that very indefinite phrase, "it came to pass," or, "now at that time." The strength of the argument by which the incidental character of the Diaconate is established, depends a good deal on the fact whether the account given (Acts vi) relates to the appointment of the first Deacons, or to a supplementary body of Grecian Deacons. We say depends a good deal, because the fact that the historian did not think it necessary to relate the ordination of the original Deacons, might make it *appear* probable that his account of the supplementary Diaconate was incidental only.

Yet we cannot admit that this is a probable supposition, since the argument for the permanent force of inspired details forbids our entertaining the idea, the essential point being—*the possession by us of an inspired account of the appointment of certain Church officers by the Apostles.* That the relation given in Acts vi, refers to a second body of Deacons, is not therefore sufficient to prove the narrative incidental, though it might corroborate this view when rendered probable from other considerations, such as the following: "Again (says Dr. W.) every attentive reader must have been struck with the circumstance, that there is no such description on record of the first appointment of the higher orders of Christian Ministers, as there is of the ordination of the inferior class, the Deacons, and this con-

sideration alone would lead a reflecting mind to conclude, or at least strongly suspect, that the particular notice of the appointment of Deacons is incidental only." Dr. W. must mean by "no such description," no such by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, for assuredly the mention made by the Evangelists of the ordination and commission of the Seventy, and the Twelve, both before and after the Resurrection, is quite as diffuse and ample as that of the Deacons; and even as regards the Presbyters, the mention of their duties, and the manner of their ordination, are fully as explicit as that of the Deacons. The account of the Deacon's office and ordination being stated in a single chapter connectedly, while that of the Presbyters is spread over a volume, and can only be arrived at by gathering up fragments of the history and putting them together, may make the account of the former appear more definite; yet we can ascertain the duties of the Presbyters as certainly as those of the Deacons. While there is nothing said of the ordination of the one, which is not said of the ordination of the other, the form in both cases being, prayer and imposition of hands by the Apostles; let it also be remembered, that according to Dr. W's own admission, a fact mentioned incidentally may appear at first sight less striking than a distinct enunciation, though it may be the more decisive for that reason, because the writer may allude to some truth as familiarly *known* to those he was addressing. Now in illustration of this we may mention, that before St. Luke had written anything about the ordination of elders (as in Acts xiv, 23) he incidentally mentions the existence of elders; "which also they did and sent it to *the elders* by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." Acts xi, 30.

The incidental character of the history of the Diaconate consists, according to our author, in its being "a natural and almost necessary introduction to that of two most important events, the great outbreak of persecution consequent on Stephen's martyrdom, and the conversion of Samaria." But admitting that the introduction is a natural one, when we consider that it occurs in the work of a writer remarkable for the suddenness of his transitions, generally dispensing with the natural and connecting links, and commencing and terminating his narratives abruptly, we are led to a directly opposite conclusion, namely, that when he *does* make use of an introduction, the subject matter of it is no less instructive (and no less intentionally so) than the topic to which it leads; since there was nothing to prevent St. Luke introducing us to Stephen and Philip, as abruptly as he does to Saul, Cornelius

or Apollos. Indeed, abruptness was almost unavoidable in such a work as "the Acts," which is an epitome of what St. Luke considered the most important events comprised in so long a period as thirty years, and when we find such a writer employing an introduction, we may conclude that he had some distinct aim in using what is so foreign to his usual style.

"The conclusion (says Dr. W.) that the particular notice of the appointment of Deacons is incidental only, is greatly strengthened, when on close examination we find reason to be convinced that these so called seven Deacons, who are usually assumed (for I never met with even an attempt at proof) to have been the first that ever held such an office, were in reality only the first Grecian Deacons, and that there were Hebrew Deacons before." The method of proof is briefly as follows. At the time of the murmuring, some dispensers there must have been. That the Apostles did not officiate is plain from the tenor of the narrative which indicates that the appeal was made to them, and that they excused themselves from presiding. The assertion "It is not meet that we should leave the word of God and serve tables," is proof certain that they did not officiate. Again, on reading over the names of the seven Deacons, we find them all of the Hellenistic party; now this surely would have produced in turn, a murmuring of the Hebrews against the Grecians, unless they had *already* some in office to look after their rights. (Essay 2, Sec. 11.)

The above considerations by which the account in Acts vi, is proved to refer to a supplementary body of Grecian Deacons, are very plausible and are fortified by the high authority of Mosheim and Bishops Onderdonk and Whately. Still we cannot assent to their correctness; nor can we help thinking that the real cause why Dr. W. never met with an attempt to prove the appointment of these Deacons the first of the kind, was simply this, that the generality of readers would scarcely think any proof necessary. However, let us now examine the validity of the reasons adduced for considering St. Luke's account to bear reference to the ordination of Hellenistic Deacons, as distinguished from an original Hebrew Diaconate. Now some dispensers of the common fund there must have been, and the question is, did the Apostles hitherto officiate as such dispensers? We think it almost certain that they did dispense the alms of the Church up to the period of the murmuring. For in the first place there is nothing which implies that the multitude appealed to them to undertake this duty; the narrative merely says that in conseqence of the discontent, the Twelve called the multitude of the disciples toge-

ther and said "ουκ αρεστον εστιν ημας καταλειψαντας τον λογον του θεου διακονειν τραπεξαις,"—the literal translation of which is, "It is not pleasing that we having left the word of God, should be serving tables;"—or in other words, the arrangement by which we dispense the funds of the Church does not give satisfaction, owing to our inability to attend to the duty—our time being occupied with the more pressing duty of preaching the word. This is plainly the meaning of the term, ουκ αρεστον εστιν, which is in opposition to the και ηρεσεν ο λογος of verse 5, and is in ch. xii. 3, translated in this way, "and when he saw that it pleased the Jews," οτι αρεστον εστι τοις Ιουδαιοις. The words which follow "but we will give ourselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the word," have absolutely no point whatever, unless we suppose that the Twelve had devoted themselves in part to some other duty besides that of the Ministry of the Word. It certainly would have been superfluous to have told the disciples that they would persevere in the Ministry of the Word and prayer, unless something had occurred which seemed to render the matter doubtful.

If confirmation of this view were needed, we have it in the fact, that in the 4th chapter we read that the price of the lands which were sold was "laid at the Apostle's feet and distribution was made to every man according as he had need." St. Peter again, was evidently the person who received the money from Ananias, and detected his fraud; while there is some significance in the fact that in the space of five verses we read no less than three times, that the money was laid "at the Apostles feet." We are not, however, to understand that the Apostles from *the very first* received the funds given by the Christians, as it would appear from ch. ii, 44, 45, that "all that believed were together and had all things common, and sold their possessions and parted them to all as many as had need," implying that the believers mutually assisted each other without the intervention of any officers for the reception or distribution of the alms. A subsequent arrangement was however evidently made by which the Apostles received the funds, though at first they could not have done so; or Peter could not with truth have said to the lame man, "Silver and gold have I none."

As to the objection, that it is not to be supposed that the Apostles would have been guilty of neglect or partiality, we reply, that there is no ground for supposing that the murmuring of the Grecians was warranted; and we should recollect that there existed a hereditary, unappeasable feud between the Aramaic and Hellenistic Jews for centuries, which it seems their common adoption of Christianity could not obliterate

t is, therefore, more than probable that a discontent, arising etween factions predisposed to quarreling, would have but light foundation, if indeed it had any; the slighest symptom f unfairness would have been sufficient to arouse the old aniosity.

But it may be urged, that if the Apostles hitherto officiated, nd found from the great increase of disciples, that they hemselves were unable to attend to this duty, they would ave appointed a larger number than *seven* Deacons. To this e reply, that the number of Deacons required would depend not o much on the number of the disciples, as on the number of *oor* amongst them. This we have no means of ascertaining, ut we may reasonably conjecture that seven men specially set part for the work could easily accomplish what had hitherto been performed by the twelve Apostles in their spare ime.

As to the objection that the seven Deacons belonging to the Hellenistic party, would have caused a murmuring of the Hebrews, unless there were already native Jews in office, we nswer, that we cannot positively affirm, from the names being recian, that there were no native Jews among them. Almost very remarkable person mentioned in the New Testament as known by some surname. Indeed the custom of surnamg seems to have been universal. Perhaps it arose from the inreased intercourse between Jerusalem and Grecian cities, which ould cause a native Jew's name to be Grecianized, or a Grean Jew's name to be Hebraized according to his place of reidence. But from whatever cause arising, the fact seems to be at native Jews very generally possessed a Grecian surname. us St. Paul's name amongst the native Jews would be Σαουλ, d it is remarkable that St Luke, when speaking of him calls m by his Grecian name Σαυλος, but when he records his being dressed from Heaven, he uses the Hebrew form of the name,—*de* Acts 9, 4 and 22, 7,—since we are told that the voice spake him in that language. Some of the Apostles also had Grean names, such as Διδιμος, Πετρος, Φιλιππος, but we are not to in- r that they were Hellenists. St. Mark's Jewish name was John, it his Grecian surname Μαρκος. Similarly we find the Jewish mes Tabitha and Simeon surnamed Δορκας and Νιγερ. Now St. Luke was a Gentile and writing to a Gentile, the probaility is that he would, whenever it was possible, give the Grecian name of his characters, and hence we are led to infer that o confidence can be placed in any argument drawn from the ames of the seven Deacons.

Again, if the Seven were to be a Grecian body exclusively, we cannot understand why the Apostles should have given the election of them to the whole multitude of the disciples and not to the Grecians alone, particularly as the Aramaic and Hellenistic Christians would worship in different Synagogues after their conversion to Christianity, as well as before that event. Neither on this supposition is the gratification of the *whole* multitude intelligible. It is hard to conceive why the Hebrew portion which comprised the great mass of Christians, should have been pleased with the proposition; the division of labor thus introduced, together with the prospect of increased efficiency on the part of the Apostles, when relieved from secular employment, would naturally please the Christian community, but the addition of Grecian Deacons, to counteract the inattention or partiality of Hebrews, was in itself not calculated to cause such pleasing unanimity. There seems also to be a difficulty in explaining how it happened, that the Grecians murmured against the Hebrews as a body. Why not murmur against the dispensers of the fund, rather than against the donors of it? It is but reasonable to believe that the greater part of the fund was contributed by native Jews. The Grecian minority, therefore, could not well have found fault with the Hebrews collectively, if there were almoners specially appointed to whose conduct they could with more fairness object. But on the supposition that the Apostles had hitherto, as far as time permitted, performed the duty, we at once see how delicacy and respect would prevent the Grecians from condemning the Apostles who had so powerful an apology as that of the ministry of the word, to excuse any neglect. The natural course which discontented men would under the circumstances have pursued, was to show their dissatisfaction with the Apostles, by murmuring not against them, but their countrymen.

From all these considerations we conclude that the account given (Acts vi) refers to the first appointment of Deacons;—the Apostles having *resigned*, not *declined*, the duty of serving tables,—and therefore the argument for the incidental character of the narrative, so far as it is founded on the supposition that there already existed a Hebrew Diaconate, falls to the ground.

Before leaving this subject of the Diaconate, we would observe, that there are some considerations which would lead us to conjecture that the Seven were ordained not as a resident Board to dispense the alms of the Church at Jerusalem perma-

nently, but as a body of Missionaries to establish the Diaconate in foreign Churches. One or two of the Seven may have been stationed at Jerusalem, but the Holy Spirit may have designed that a greater number than was absolutely necessary should be ordained, for the purpose of extending the Church organization of Jerusalem to other places. This may not indeed have been the intention of the Apostles or the Disciples in appointing the Seven; but the Christians were so soon to be scattered by persecution, that it could not have been with a view to the benefit of the poor Christians at Jerusalem, that the Holy Spirit devised the Diaconate; and when the persecution ceased, and "the Church had rest," we have no account of the Deacons returning to Jerusalem and resuming their duties. The probability is that they did not return, since the alms of the Christians at Antioch, which were dispatched to the poor Christians of Judæa in the dearth that occurred in the reign of Claudius, were sent to the Elders, not to the Deacons of the Church.

If this surmise be correct, we can see a design in the selection of a majority of the Seven from the Hellenistic party, as Jews speaking the Greek language would be much more likely to prove successful Missionaries to the Gentiles. It will appear also on close examination that the *incidental* character of the account of the Diaconate, cannot be established from any close connection that is supposed to exist between St. Stephen's Martyrdom and the great persecution which through "the dispersion of the Christians led to the founding of the first purely Gentile Church at Antioch." Certainly this was a most important event, but it might have been recorded by St. Luke without any reference to St. Stephen, and consequently without any allusion to the Deacons, of whom he was the most distinguished member,—internal evidence inducing us to believe that St. Stephen's death did not lead to a persecution,—but was a result of a persecution already existing. We are not told by the historian, nor have we any reason to conclude, that the persecution mentioned in Acts iv, and which caused the imprisonment of the Apostles, had ceased. No such expression occurs, as we read afterwards when persecution ceased, "then had the Churches rest;" nor is it said, at that time there *arose* a great persecution, but "at that time there *was* a great persecution."

Again, it is clear that *at the time* of St. Stephen's Martyrdom, the Christians were scattered through Judæa and Samaria—otherwise we are forced to believe that the whole body of disciples, amounting to many thousands, fled from Je-

rusalem in the short space of time intervening between St. Stephen's death and burial—the dispersion of the disciples being evidently mentioned to account for the fact of the Martyr's obsequies devolving on "devout men," that is, converts from Idolatry to Judaism. Unless we accept this interpretation, verse second seems most awkwardly thrust into the account of the persecution, without any connexion with the narrative. But if we translate the verse thus, "*But* devout men carried Stephen to his burial," the sense becomes apparent, the persecution already existing had scattered the disciples, but devout men supplied their place at the interment. The idea that St. Stephen's martyrdom led to the persecution, seems justified by the words of the historian, Chapter xi, 19—"Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution which arose about Stephen"—but the considerations mentioned, would lead us to conjecture that there must be some mistake in the reading or translation of the passage. Accordingly we find Griesbach considering the reading επι Στεφανω to be preferred, and the text may accordingly be translated, "the persecution that arose in Stephen's time,"—or while Stephen's wonderful career was going on—as we read in the 28th verse, the words επι Κλαυδιου translated, "in the days of Claudius Cæsar."

To us, it seems little short of certainty that there is a system of Church Government absolute and definite prescribed in the New Testament. It is nothing to the purpose to affirm that Christian communities cannot agree in the reception of any one universal system. Neither can they unite in the affirmation of any one creed of doctrine. Nor is it more surprising that the Scriptural mode of organizing a Church should not be unanimously adopted, than that the doctrines of Election and Free-will, Salvation by Faith and works, should still be undecided questions, and each possess enthusiastic opponents and adherents. It is quite possible that former ages may have approximated nearer to the Scriptural standard of Church organization than the present; some communities may now approach nearly (very nearly) to the Apostolic model, while others may not attain to the slightest resemblance to it. There may not be a Church on earth that *fully* comes up to that exemplar which may be inferred by fair process of reasoning from the Apostles' language. Yet still, it may be no less true, that in that language is to be found directions sufficient to guide an honest, impartial mind to a recognition of that Visible Church, which existed in the Apostles' days with the Apostles' sanction. This discovery may have been made partially at one age, more nearly at another

but never as yet completely and exactly, because we are led irresistibly by the analogy of nature and the result of experience to acquiesce in the profound remark of Bishop Butler, that "it is not at all incredible that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind should contain many truths as yet undiscovered."

From the analogy, therefore, which really and naturally exists between the style, the designed style in which Doctrines and rules of Government are revealed, we are forced to object to any theory which would represent the latter as indifferent; and it is mere idleness to object that some of those rules are plainly inapplicable to the present day, because, had those rules been followed from the beginning, they would not now be obsolete or inappropriate. To quote again the words of the incomparable reasoner above alluded to, "we cannot proceed one step in reasoning upon natural religion any more than upon Christianity without laying it down as a first principle, that the dispensations of Providence are not to be judged of by their perversions, but by their genuine tendencies, not by what they do actually seem to effect, but by what they would effect, if mankind did their part."

Art. IV.—DR. JOHN ESTEN COOKE.

We have long been anxious to discharge a sacred duty which we owe to the Church and to the memory of one of her most devoted sons—the late John Esten Cooke, M. D. Dr. Cooke was one of the most remarkable men of our day. With great powers of observation and application, there was combined in him a logical force unsurpassed and hardly equaled, by any of his contemporaries in Church or State. The greater part of his life was spent in the active practice of his arduous and engrossing profession, and in the composition of some of the ablest works that have ever illustrated and enlarged the science of medicine. Long after he had passed the meridian of life, and while he was in the full practice of his profession, and engaged with all the earnestness and enthusiasm of his character in teaching this noble science to others, he was led, by an apparent accident, but by a real Providence, to examine the history and constitution of the Christian Church. The absorbing interest of the theme at once enlisted all his powers. With unparalleled industry and intense concentration of mind, he gave himself up to the enquiry. In a few months he accumulated and thoroughly digested the lore which ordinary theologians require a lifetime to obtain. The remarkable publications in which he exhibited the results of his great mind, operating upon this mass of erudition, placed him at once in the front rank of the theological writers of his age and country. For many years after this, he continued to be the enthusiastic student and the successful teacher of both these two great departments of human learning—Medicine and Theology. It is due to the Church and to the world, that the memory of such a man should not die.

John Esten Cooke was born in Boston, Mass., on the 2nd of March, 1783, while his parents were on a visit to that city. His father, Dr. Stephen Cooke, and his mother, Catharine Esten, were natives of the island of Bermuda, "connected," says Mr. Caswall, "with some distinguished families in England." They continued to reside in Bermuda until 1791. In that year they removed to Alexandria, in Virginia, and not long afterwards to Loudon County, Va., near Leesburg. They had eight children, six sons and two daughters. One of the sons, John R. Cooke, attained to considerable eminence at the

bar; and another, St. George Cooke, is still serving with distinguished reputation in the army of the United States.

John Esten Cooke, the eldest son, received the degree of Doctor of Medicine, from the University of Pennsylvania, and commenced the practice of his profession in Warrenton, Fauquier County, Va. In 1821, he removed to Winchester, then the chief town of the "Great Valley of Virginia." In this rich and beautiful valley flows the Shenandoah to its junction with the Potomac, having the Blue Ridge on the East, and the Alleghany mountains on the West. Dr. Cooke remained in this place in the active practice, and in the enthusiastic study, of his profession, until 1827. Here he published an Essay on Fever, which excited very great attention, and soon afterwards the first volume of his great work on Pathology and Therapeutics.

In 1827, Dr. Cooke was elected to the Chair of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in the University of Transylvania; and, accepting that office, removed the same year with his family to Lexington, Ky.

His career as a Professor in that school, was one great and almost unexampled triumph. Although troubled with a slight impediment of speech, the earnestness of his manner, the depth of his convictions, the singleness of his purpose, the simplicity and comprehensiveness of his views, and the evident intensity of his devotion to truth, made him the most interesting of lecturers. His system of Pathology, and the practice founded thereon, very soon obtained an unquestioned ascendency, and almost universal acceptance, in the West and Southwest.

The simplicity of that system, and the consequent facility with which it could be abused by inexperienced and unskillful physicians, and even by unprofessional persons, are probably the causes in part of the rapid decline of the system in professional favor, about the time that Dr. Cooke ceased to be its public teacher and expounder. Another, and the principal cause for this result, is the fact that the current literature of the Medical profession in this country, comes from London, Edinburgh, and Paris.

That a Medical system, proposing itself as true and substantial, and implying of course that preceding systems had been visionary and shadowy, and therefore entitled to take the place of them all, and to keep it, had originated with a country Doctor in the Valley of Virginia, or with a Professor in a backwoods college at Lexington, Ky., was an idea which the profession at large would not entertain. So the influence of Dr. Cooke's lectures and writings was confined to the West. The magnates of the profession in the great Eastern cities and

colleges, paid little or no attention to this new system, and still continued to look for knowledge and instruction to European centres of intelligence.

Soon after his removal to Lexington, Dr. Cooke published the second volume of his treatise on Pathology and Therapeutics. Of this remarkable effort of genius and labor, we of course express our own opinion in saying, that it is unsurpassed by the profoundest works in Law, Theology, or Medicine, for its large array of facts, and for its close and impenetrable logic.

In 1828, Dr. Cooke, in conjunction with Dr. Charles W. Short, Professor of Materia Medica and Medical Botany in the same University, commenced the publication of "The Transylvania Journal of Medicine and the Associate Sciences." All the early volumes of this Journal are enriched by the labors of Dr. Cooke. He contributed to it a succession of valuable papers on many of the most important practical questions connected with his profession. Speaking of these papers, the Editor of the Western Journal of Medicine and Surgery, said in 1854, "Honesty of purpose marks everything which has emanated from the pen of Dr. Cooke. It is visible in every page of his voluminous writings. He sought truth, and truth only. He never contended for victory, but for principle. * * * * * His works are models of a clear, direct, simple style." Dr. Yandell very beautifully adds, "It has been remarked, that few men can be trusted to write their own biographies. Dr. Cooke is one of the few who, without any detriment to his fame, might have performed that delicate work. He would have written his life with all the honesty that he lived it—with perfect impartiality, keeping nothing back through a weak vanity, and exaggerating nothing." (West. Journal of M. and S., Oct., 1854.)

The Medical views of Dr. Cooke, so ably and perseveringly maintained, were subjected to a severe but triumphant test by the Cholera which desolated Lexington in 1833. Dr. C. was in Philadelphia at the time of its terrific access. He hurried to the scene of danger as fast as the conveyances of the day would admit, and threw himself into the conflict with his wonted energy and decision. He considered Cholera as belonging to the class of Malarious diseases, and treated it as such, but with a vigor of administration proportioned to the frightful violence of the malady. In a paper published in the Transylvania Journal of Med., he gives a history of each case, and demonstrates, as far as complete success could do it, the soundness of his views, and the propriety of his treatment.

It was during this most active period of his active life that Dr. Cooke was called upon to turn his great powers to another

y different field of research. For many years previous
, he had been a zealous and devoted member of the
ist Communion. The causes that induced him to aban-
s connection, and to attach himself to the Protestant
al Church, are fully stated by himself in the introduc-
his Essay on "The Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordina-
The extract we give is long, but it will well repay

ıen a man who has, for eighteen years of his life, taken
'e part in the concerns of a religious society, and pro-
ts interests with all his power, leaves it and attaches
to another, a decent respect for their opinion, as well as
r regard for his own character for consistency and up-
ss, renders it not improper that he should state the rea-
ıich induced him to make the change. This I propose
ı the following pages.
ıse who know me intimately, know that I have ever em-
the truth when convinced I had discovered it, with little
for the consequences that might follow. Having had the
)f the Christian religion impressed upon my mind by
vearied care of a most affectionate mother, I occasion-
d serious reflections on the subject, although in general
too indifferent to it, until about nineteen years ago. In
ımer of 1810, I met with a pamphlet called the 'Star
East,' by Dr. Buchanan, giving an account, among
ıings, of the discovery of a Christian Church in Hindoo-
cluded from all the world, which derived its origin from
)ostles themselves. This narrative produced a very
impression on my mind, and, as I had been for some
more thoughtful than common on the subject of relig-
determined to investigate the evidence on which the
es of the Christian religion rest. Shortly after, a book-
passed through the village, and I purchased a Bible
ınne's marginal references, and Bishop Porteus' Eviden-
he Christian Revelation.
ad always been in the habit of requiring strong evidence
very subject, and never yielding assent to any thing
ıs not supported by it. I sat down, therefore, to the
of Porteus with the determination narrowly to examine
igh every argument.
ə result was a strong impression made on my mind by the
rusal, during which no quotations from the Scripture
xamined, the interest excited by the force of the argu-
eing too great to allow stopping to examine them. The
as read, however, very attentively a second time, with
examinations of the quotations of Scripture, and the

result was a thorough conviction of the truth of the Christia Revelation; immediately on expressing which to myself, wit an audible voice, I felt my mind drawn out in a feeling of gra itude and love to that Saviour who had died that I might live— the first I had experienced, and not to be forgotten while lif and recollection shall continue. The first reading of this boo was in September or October, 1810. It had such an effect o my mind as to lead me to regular private devotion. The sec ond reading was about Christmas.

"Between the middle and end of January, I heard my frien Mr. Yidings, to whom I was then an entire stranger, preach fo the first time, and again on the Sunday following, and was s much pleased that on the Sunday week after I became a membe of the Methodist Society, which I then considered the pures Church as to doctrine. In that society I have continued eve since, in general, well satisfied; and among its members, bu particularly the preachers of the Baltimore Annual Conference I have many valued friends. These I would not offend, I woul not appear to slight, for any thing less than conscience' sak That I have, until within the last eight weeks, taken an activ part in promoting the welfare of the society which I have left is well known to some of them, and was not long ago evince in the part I took in the establishment of a religious pape to be published by the Methodist Society.

"Soon after that time a volume of sermons by the Rev. Dr Chapman, for which I had subscribed, was brought home, an for some days no attention was paid to it. At a leisure mo ment curiosity led me to look into it, when I found the manne and style so striking, and the subject so new to me, that I de termined to read the book. I had heard that the Church de nied the validity of Presbyterian ordination; but had never thought it worth while to inquire into a claim at first sight ap parently so extravagant. I was determined to see what could be said in support of such pretensions. I read carefully the first seven sermons, by which I was most forcibly struck. The language chaste, the style perspicuous, I was carried along without labor, and comprehended without the slightest effort. The manner of handling the subject was strikingly moderate, and as charitable as any man could reasonably desire. Supporting the doctrine of the invalidity of ordination by Presbyters, and the validity by Episcopal ordination alone, the author proceeds in maintaining the argument, without uncharitable reflections; and when he condemns, does it in the mildest language, and often or always with expressions of good opinion of the motives of the opposite party. If there is any thing offensive to any one, in the book, it is a quotation—and quotations

a man is bound to state as they are stated by the author from whom they are taken. To do otherwise, to change language, to curtail, to omit material expressions, without informing the reader, is to act corruptly, and is so esteemed by all men of letters, and justly so.

"The argument itself is exceedingly strong, and in the language of a gentleman of this place in conversation with me, it is the best array of the question, perhaps, anywhere to be found in the same compass.

"The strength of the direct argument for the doctrine, and of that indirect one, growing out of the evil consequences of schism, or division from the Church, contained in some of the following sermons, is such, that I was compelled to say to myself, if these facts are so, this doctrine is the truth. Uneasiness now sprung up in my mind. The question arose, what if it be true? Can you leave your friends, your intimate associates in what has engaged so much of your attention, your efforts, your ardent desires for eighteen years, and go to a people who, prejudice whispered, are no people? The answer of conscience was, if it be the truth, embrace it, and leave the consequences to Him, who revealed His will to man for his guidance.

"The question now was, is this doctrine true? To determine this without delay, I sought information from ministers of the principal denominations involved in the doubt as to the validity of Presbyterian ordination, viz: the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and Baptists. With one consent they all referred me to Miller's Letters on this subject. This book I immediately obtained. Emory and Bangs were also mentioned, and were likewise obtained.

"Meeting Dr. Chapman in the street, I inquired of him also what were the standard works on this controversy. He also mentioned Miller, and stated that Bowden had answered him. He also mentioned Lord King, (by whom John Wesley was influenced,) and Slater's Original Draught, in answer to King, as well as Potter on Church Government, and Hooker's work.

"I immediately commenced reading Miller with great attention, read over and over the arguments respecting the order of the Church in the time of the Apostles and for centuries afterwards, with his quotations from such of the Fathers as could be procured conveniently; and with regard to those which I had not, I was enabled to form a very good idea from comparing him with Bowden. Thus, if he quoted a passage from an author which I had not the means of consulting, Bowden was examined to see what reply was made; if admitted by him, it could not be questioned; if not admitted, Miller's reply to Bowden's answer was examined; and if necessary, Bowden's rejoinder to Miller's reply.

So that from the two works of each, it was not a difficult matter, with care, to make out what was agreed to by both these able disputants, and what was asserted, but, when answered, not maintained in the reply, and therefore given up; in short, it was not difficult to get at the truth.

"The result of the whole investigation, after six weeks' close inquiry, was a thorough conviction of the truth of the doctrine that Presbyterian ordination is unauthorized by scripture, and therefore entirely invalid.

"In order that those of my friends and others into whose hands this pamphlet falls, without having it in their power to consult the books above mentioned, may be able to judge of the validity of the reasons on which rests the conclusion I have come to, I propose to make some remarks on the argument of Dr. Miller, the statements he has advanced, and the manner in which he has answered the arguments of the Episcopal writers; and close with a condensed statement of facts showing the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination."

The statement of some further circumstances attending thi conversion will be interesting, as eminently characteristic c the man. Dr. Cooke had only subscribed to the volume co taining Chapman's Sermons as a matter of courtesy to a co league, Dr. Chapman being one of the Professors in Transylv nia University. After the book had been sent to his hous Dr. Cooke remarked to his family and to some friends at di ner, how strange it was that so intelligent and good a man Dr. Chapman should entertain, and attempt to propagate, tl narrow-minded notions which he had heard were in his boo On the following Sunday, between breakfast and Church tim he took this book from the parlor table where it had first be placed, and began to read it. By the time the family we ready to go to Church he had become intensely interested the book. He saw that there was a real question raised in which he was bound to determine. He permitted his fami therefore to go alone, while he continued his examination the argument which was to control his future religious positio The doubt once planted in his mind as to the ministerial a thority of those to whose jurisdiction he had heretofore su mitted, he could take no rest until the doubt was resolved.

The Library of the University, rich in many old books, a the private libraries of Lexington, were diligently ransacke The examination was begun and prosecuted with all the ard of a strong and enthusiastic nature. Only four hours we allowed for sleep; one hour was given to the accustomed l ture to the Medical Class; the shortest possible time to mea

and all the rest of the twenty-four, with all the concentration of his great powers, devoted to the absorbing enquiry upon which he had entered.

To relieve the brain from the effects of this intense and unremitted application, and to keep his mind in its highest state of free and vigorous action, he several times bled himself during the six weeks of this remarkable investigation. At the end of that time his conviction was complete, and the materials of that conviction, soon afterwards embodied into the Essay above mentioned, were accumulated, and ready for present and future use. He immediately connected himself with the Episcopal Church, and neither he nor his family ever after attended any other form of worship.

The first duty required of Dr. Cooke, was to satisfy the public mind, greatly excited by his conversion, as to the grounds of it. For this purpose he published one of the most powerful and conclusive arguments ever produced upon the question of Church government—the Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination. This masterly work made a deep impression upon the public, and upon the Church. It was immediately republished in New York, and scattered in various forms over the country. Dr. Miller, or some friend of his, attempted a reply in the Princeton Review. But this was met by a crushing rejoinder from Dr. Cooke, which damaged yet more the cause which the Review had tried to defend.

With all the force and enthusiasm of his character Dr. Cooke now applied himself to raise up the Church in Kentucky, from her fallen and desolate condition. The consecration of a Bishop for the Diocese in 1832, the establishment of a Theological Seminary at Lexington in 1834, the attraction to the same place of a body of learned and distinguished Ministers of the Church —among whom may be mentioned the Rev. Dr. Coit, the two Leacocks, the Rev. Henry Caswall, and the Rev. B. O. Peers— attest the earnestness and enthusiasm with which he gave himself to this genial work.

As Professor of the History and Polity of the Church in the Theological Seminary, and as a member of the Standing Committee of the Diocese, Dr. Cooke employed the whole force of his character and genius in aid of the rising fortunes of the Church. He very soon accumulated one of the best private theological libraries in this country, the greater part of which has since passed into the hands of the Bishop of Louisiana.

As a Delegate to the General Convention, which assembled in Philadelphia, in 1835, Dr. Cooke startled from their quiet conservatism the members of that body, by introducing a reso-

lution providing for the immediate election and consecration of a Bishop for each State and Territory in the United States in which there was no Bishop. This sweeping, thorough, and admirable proposition was afterwards whittled down by the cautious policy of the Convention to the election of two Missionary Bishops for the West. And of these only one was actually consecrated. Thus again the Church was found lagging far behind her duty and her calling.

Another effort which he made, in conjunction with the able theologians then gathered at Lexington, to advance the cause of the Church in Kentucky, was the establishment of a religious paper called the Church Advocate. For sometime Dr. Cooke edited this paper himself, but subsequently committed that work to the Rev. Henry Caswall.

It is well known that this early dawn of the Church's prosperity in Kentucky, was soon and sadly overcast. To inquire into the causes of this sudden eclipse of so bright a promise would be an ungrateful and a painful task. To bring up again the memory of old troubles, of criminations and recriminations between men who were all anxious to do good, but who partook of the common infirmities of human nature, could be of no possible service to the Church. Better let it all be forgotten.

One practical conclusion may perhaps be profitably drawn. The effort then made for the extension of the Church in Kentucky, involved too much centralization. The large ecclesiastical force concentrated at Lexington, was utterly disproportioned to the condition and strength of the Diocese. It was a enormous head without a body. If Dr. Cooke and his fellow Churchmen could have brought from the East a band of *itinerant preachers*, and sent them, with the Bishop at their head through the State, gathering up and organizing into congregations the Episcopal families which were thickly scattered over the whole country, the result would have been very different.

At that time the traditional regard and love for the Episcopal Church, which the educated class of emigrants from Virginia brought with them, had not yet ceased. The old dust-covered Prayer-books were still in many a house; and out of those Prayer-books some of the older persons had been taught the catechism in their childhood. This was the feeling which built up the Church at Lexington, and at Louisville. In these places, the principal towns of the State, the old Church influence was found to be strong enough to support a stationed minister as soon as the trial was made. In other parts of the State the

influence was diffused over too large a space to be reached effectually in any other way than by *a mission* embracing a large district, every prominent point in the district being served by the same Minister. This was the system by which the Church was so rapidly resuscitated in Virginia, the old home of the fathers of these Kentuckians. When the venerable Richard Channing Moore, with his lofty and subduing eloquence, sounded the rallying cry throughout the Eastern counties of the Old Dominion, a glad and grateful response came up from every neighborhood, and the Church was at once re-established in the hearts of the people. Unhappily this policy was not pursued in Kentucky, and the consequence is that we still mourn, and will probably long be compelled to mourn, over the deplorable weakness of the Church in this Diocese.

All that can possibly be said in censure of Dr. Cooke, in regard to the unhappy condition of the Diocese, which so soon followed its too sudden prosperity, may also be used in his vindication, viz: that he enacted the part which belonged to the sternness of his character, to his intense devotion to truth, and to his uncompromising spirit. To these severer traits of character in him, and in some of his compeers, may possibly be attributed, in part, the disasters which ensued. More pliability, and a larger allowance for human infirmity than these gentlemen possessed or exercised, would seem, from the result of this case, to be necessary to the successful conduct of affairs. Certain it is, that to look for perfection in men, and to stop the wheels of government until it can be found, will render any government and any society impracticable.

Disappointed and disheartened by the course which things had taken, Dr. Cooke threw up all his ecclesiastical appointments, but remained to the last a devout, earnest, honest, and simple-hearted Christian, passionately devoted to the cause of Christ and the Church.

Dr. Cooke remained for ten years in Lexington, earnestly laboring in the two departments of human knowledge to which he devoted his whole powers, medical science, and Christian truth. A noble champion he was in both fields, and worthy to be held in ever-during remembrance.

About the close of this period, the admirable position, and the rapid growth of Louisville, induced the majority of the Professors in Transylvania to look to that City as the most eligible place in the Western country for the establishment of a great Medical School. Accordingly, in 1837, Dr. Cooke removed from Lexington to Louisville, and united with Drs. Caldwell, Yandell, and Short, in founding the Medical Insti-

tute of that city; now known as the Medical Department of the University of Louisville. He continued to teach in this school until its prosperity was placed beyond the reach of question, or of Western competition.

In 1844, Dr. Cooke resigned his professorship and retired to Woodlawn, a beautiful farm in the neighborhood of Louisville. A few years later, in 1848, he purchased a large unimproved estate on the bank of the Ohio river, about thirty miles above Louisville, where his restless energies were employed in the inappropriate labors, for him, of the farmer and the pioneer. The wild beauties of nature, which he intensely enjoyed, the love of his family, and the consolations of religion, were here his solace and delight.

For many years he had been subject, upon exposure, to violent attacks of inflammation of the lungs. These he had often removed by the prompt application of his own vigorous treatment. These attacks became so frequent under the exposure incident to his new mode of life on the Ohio, that his strong constitution gradually gave way; and on the 19th of October, 1853, in the 71st year of his age, he breathed his last, with a firm trust in the mercy of the Saviour whom he had loved and served for the greater part of a long life. While on his death bed, for many weeks, and until within a few hours of his death, the Greek Testament was his constant companion. All day long, and every day, he pored over its sacred pages with critical attention and with devout affection. His mind retained its power and freshness to the last, and to the last he was, as he had ever been, the single hearted worshiper of truth. Truth and Love he found embodied in the Word of the Almighty, and on that his soul rested, in life and in death, with satisfied delight.

There were two marked features of Dr. Cooke's character which precluded his ever attaining to vulgar popularity; and which must be allowed to have diminished greatly his capacity for usefulness. These were his indifference to public opinion, and his stern intolerance of error and flippancy. He threw his great truths before the world, and used no further care to commend or introduce them. He took it for granted that every man would be as devout a worshiper of Truth as himself, and he was at very little pains to conceal his contempt for those who seemed to care more for everything else than for truth. This disposition created for him many enemies, and was one cause of his premature withdrawal from public employments.

It is no bad illustration of the character of both to mention that Dr. Cooke admired beyond any man of his time a rising

statesman of Kentucky, the Hon. Garrett Davis. Their personal acquaintance was very slight, but congeniality of mind and character excited this admiration. Dr. Cooke loved and honored Davis, because Davis loved and honored truth more than place and power and popularity; and was utterly fearless and regardless of consequences in his advocacy of truth. Not very long before his death the Doctor was introduced to Davis in the Court House yard, at Paris, Ky. Not attending particularly to the name, the introduction passed as such things usually do. A moment after he learned to whom he had been speaking. Instantly he sought for Davis in the crowd, and grasping again his hand, told him that he was the man of all others he wanted to see—the man who was never afraid to speak the truth.

Stern, and sometimes even harsh, in his intercourse with the world, Dr. Cooke was gentle, tender, and childlike in his religious affections, in the domestic circle, and in social intercourse with the friends he loved. With these last he was ever the warm hearted, genial companion. Without reserve he unbosomed himself to them, and enjoyed beyond most men the pleasures of conversation—the delightful interchange of thought and feeling.

It was deeply affecting to see that strong old man passionately weeping at bidding adieu to the Christian Minister, who, from time to time, celebrated at his secluded home on the Ohio the solemn offices of religion. The profound religious sensibility of this great man, so learned, so powerful in intellect, and so strong in all the elements of true manhood, is a withering rebuke to the vulgar irreligion of the vain, the trifling, and the ignorant.

Dr. Cooke frequently, in the last year of his life, expressed a wish to prepare a Popular Manual for the benefit of several large classes of sufferers, setting forth the method by which he had been accustomed to relieve them, and the principles of that method. It will be an appropriate tribute to the memory of this good man to present, especially to the Clergy, his *rationale* of the invalid state into which they are so liable to fall, and the means of preventing or relieving it. The account is drawn up with especial reference to the Clergy, but it is equally applicable to all who are similarly affected, and especially to the whole army of dyspeptics of every class and profession. The following is a brief statement of its principles and reasonings, and which in this place deserves to be presented to the reader.

All general disease is an approximation, more or less remote, to death. In death the arteries are diminished, the extremities shriveled, and a great portion of the blood engorged in the right side of the heart and in the great venous cavities of the body. The chill which precedes a fever furnishes an instance of a rapid approach to this state. The pallor, the coldness, the shrunken extremities, the diminished arterial action, present a very ominous counterfeit semblance of death; and unless that condition is changed there would soon be no counterfeit, but the reality. Fever is the result of the vital force repelling with urgent violence the insidious mischief, the creeping death. Unless the fever supervene, death must ensue. All the apparent symptoms of a chill indicate that a large portion of the blood is engorged in the right side of the heart, and in the great venous trunks.

But everything that diminishes the force of the circulation tends, in its degree, to produce this same result. For if the blood is not sent with sufficient force through the lungs to be purified and oxygenated, and is not then sent to the extremities of the system to be used, it must *necessarily accumulate* as black, impure blood, in the vena cava and in the other large receptacles of venous blood. This process once begun, perpetuates and reproduces itself in two ways: 1st, The venous receptacles become enlarged and weakened, making it more difficult for the blood to be returned to the heart. 2d, The less the blood is oxygenated the less can it stimulate the heart to action. In old age the circulating force gradually decreases—more and more of the blood is retained in the venous system—giving rise to the stiffness, aches, and pains of age, and as this process gradually goes on, death must inevitably at last ensue. Most general chronic affections are just an anticipation of this state.

Whatever diminishes the force of the circulation below the standard of health, accumulates the impure, black blood in the great venous cavities—that is, in the vena cava,—in the vena porta or great vein of the liver, and in all the contiguous venous trunks. Such an engorgement affects the whole of the abdominal viscera and the brain alike—for the jugular veins are as closely connected with the vena cava as any of the veins of the trunk. In autumnal fevers these veins are suddenly and perilously engorged, giving rise to the various symptoms characteristic of that class of diseases. These symptoms indicate that the brain, and all the abdominal viscera are disturbed and more or less interrupted in the performance of their functions.

When the force of the circulation is impaired in a much less

t frequently, and under the influence of causes con-
erating, the same engorgement takes place in a pro-
degree, and insensibly increases, the parts adapting
gradually and without much immediate disturbance,
ormal state, until some chronic disease is firmly es-

The most common chronic affection proceeding
cause, is dyspepsia, with its concurrent train of ills.
ese are nervousness, vertigo, tremors, palpitation of
constipation, diarrhœa, sour or fetid eructations,
h, heartburn, general debility, and low spirits.
ptoms do not all appear together or in the same per-
cur indifferently, according to circumstances and to
es of constitution. They all proceed from the same
unnatural turgescence of the venous system of the
ted with impure blood; thus hindering, or entirely
, according to the degree of the evil, the performance
thy functions of those parts.

us see how this state gradually creeps upon a clergy-
active discharge of his duties. 1. Sedentary habits
he force of the circulation, as has always been known,
he mode of the action of this cause has been most
lained by Liebig. 2. Intense mental action is sure
wed by a marked diminution in the circulating force.
ion is far more exhausting than physical action. 3.
nent above the normal point requires by a self-adjust-
the economy, a correspondent depression or diminu-
ce. If this period of depressed vital force could be
the quiescent state which is plainly indicated, the
ndard would gradually be reassumed. If, on the
he system is called upon while in this state for re-
rtions, the evil will be aggravated, and a cause of
disease established. The clergyman, beyond any
of the community, is subject to all these causes of
circulation. The sedentary habits and intense men-
of his calling are shared by all students. The high
of his Sunday work, recurring at regular weekly
s peculiar to himself. Lawyers are usually exhausted
of a term, but then comes a long season of repose and
and the occasions in which a lawyer is called upon
is utmost powers, are rare. The ordinary routine of
s but little the equable flow of his mind, his spirits,
nper. But a clergyman is called upon every Sun-
least, to spend four hours in a state of the highest
, in the performance of one of the most arduous, re-
and difficult of human actions. The corresponding

depression is inevitable. And this result is greatly aggravated by that mysterious tendency of the human system to conform itself to a weekly cycle. After a habit of the body has once been established, the weekly return of the accustomed period will sometimes bring on the condition, even without the usual exciting cause, much more will it increase the action of that cause.

Under the influence of these combined circumstances, the force of the circulation is weakened every week in the case of every clergyman engaged in active duty. Of course there is a corresponding accumulation of impure blood in the great veins of the brain and of the abdominal viscera. At first this is so slight as to attract little or no attention. But the continued operation of the same causes for a series of years, gradually enlarges and diminishes the strength and tone of the venous receptacles. They become permanently distended with an accumulation of the impure venous blood. The exercise of Sunday now produces, for the next day or two, headache, a sense of extreme weariness, and good-for-nothingness. Presently dyspepsia, with more or fewer of its accustomed train of ills, sets in. The first remedy for these accumulating ills usually applied is a resort to stimulants. "A little wine for thy stomach's sake," is the advice of the friend, and the prescription of the physician, fortified by the supposed authority of Holy Writ. The immediate result seems to sanction the judiciousness of the advice. The system is forced up by this adventitious aid to the healthy standard, and the disagreeable symptoms are driven off by the removal of their cause—the venous congestion, i. e. the fever, thus artificially produced, has the same effect as the fever which follows a chill. But this stimulus has been applied to a system already jaded. To continue the same effects, the artificial stimulus must be continually increased. Each present relief is accompanied with a more rapid waste of the vital force by which the circulation is carried on and the organic functions performed. The comfortable feelings of each day are purchased by a corresponding relaxation, and consequent engorgement of the venous system at night. Hence, the discomfort and the disagreeable taste in the mouth with which the sufferer awakes in the morning. At last no amount of stimulus consistent with sobriety will answer the purpose, and we have the broken down minister—the confirmed valetudinarian. A summer at the Springs, acting most happily upon the mind and body together, enables him to go a while longer. When again, if he is sick, or is the Rector of a rich and liberal congregation, a year's travel in Europe and Asia almost restores him to the feelings and to the elasticity of youth.

The modus operandi of these health restoring processes is apparent. 1. The remote causes of disease—the sedentary habit, the anxiety, the intellectual exertion, and the mental excitement, are all removed. 2. All mineral springs of any reputation possess a gentle cathartic power, which acting constantly, and without irritation, for eight or ten weeks, gradually removes the venous congestion, by direct action upon the vena porta, the great vein of the liver. 3. All the surrounding circumstances are favorable to a maintenance of the whole system, mind and body, in a normal state. The alterative effect of a sea voyage, and all the accompaniments of foreign travel, produce the same result.

But how is this train of evils to be prevented, or their approach retarded? The young men who are principally concerned in this question will hardly regard the subject with sufficient seriousness to heed the answer. That answer is, 1. Obey the law of the Sabbath, that law which requires a day in every week of rest and relaxation from *accustomed* pursuits. 2. Submit to the pathological law which requires that the system over-strained on Sunday, shall be allowed to recover its tone on Monday, by sleep, and rest, and abstinence from food, and pleasant recreation. The transfer by the Clergy of the weekly abstinence from Friday to Monday is very important. For when the stomach is in that state of incipient disease which I have described, to call upon it to perform the active function of digestion upon three full meals is most injurious. All these rules apply to the cure as well as to the prevention of disease. Unfortunately there is but one of them, abstinence, which the clergyman can absolutely command.

But when the valetudinarian state has begun, or is established, how is a cure to be effected, and a comfortable degree of health and energy maintained? Dr. Cooke should be hailed as a benefactor by the Clergy and by the whole mighty army of dyspeptics, not only for pointing out the cause of their sufferings, but for indicating the remedy.

The great remedial agent, *in addition to the hygienic rules already mentioned*, is the long continued use of any medicine which will operate directly upon the liver, and discharge the impure contents of the engorged vena porta. But it is essential that this should be done gradually and gently. Active purging produces great disturbance of the whole system, weakens the circulation, and thereby increases the disease. So, any medicine which acts upon the mucous membrane of the bowels, and produces watery discharges, increases the debility, and thereby

aggravates the diseased condition. The disease has been gradually formed. It can only be as gradually removed. We must imitate for the dyspeptic at home, as cheaply as possible, the condition of things which he would find at an expensive watering place. There is a class of medicines which operate more immediately upon the liver. The most important of these are Calomel, Aloes, Rhubarb, Colocynth, and Epsom Salts in minute doses. Any of these, or various combinations of the first four, may be used so as to produce at least one and not more than two discharges from the bowels every day. As soon as these medicines begin to operate effectually, those discharges will be dark colored—sometimes nearly black—being principally the disordered secretion of the liver, mingled with the impure and almost unchanged contents of the engorged vena porta. From the day that these discharges are established, relief begins to be felt. Such are the close and intimate relations between the venous trunks, that, to relieve *one* of its superfluous load, is to relieve them all. The brain and the heart, and all the digestive organs, participate in the change. There is a feeling as if a small part of an oppressive load had been taken off. The judicious use of these medicines will produce these same dark colored dejections, and the sensible feeling of relief, just as long as the diseased state—the venous congestion—lasts. This may be two, four, six, or twelve months, according to the inveteracy and previous duration of the diseased condition. As the cure progresses, the discharges become lighter, and when they assume the natural color produced by the yellow bile of a healthy person, the cure is completed, and all the symptoms of disease are at an end.

In speaking of Epsom Salts as acting on the liver, it must be recollected that it only operates in this beneficial way, when used in minute doses, and in minute subdivision, just as we find it in the Epsom Springs which have attained a high reputation for health restoring properties. In doses of the common size the action of this medicine would be very injurious in the class of cases now under consideration. A teaspoonful dissolved in three tumblers of water, one half to be drunk on going to bed at night, and the other on rising in the morning, will be about the proper mode of using it. But this dose must be increased or diminished, so as to produce the effect already indicated. A less effect will not do—a greater will be hurtful. We have used for this purpose the salts evaporated from the water of the Crab Orchard Springs in Kentucky. All alcoholic stimulants must be carefully avoided by the dyspeptic, before and after his cure. As the disease will always be more liable

recur than to be engendered in the first instance, he ust be a watchful guardian of his own condition, and when-ver the state of the system requires it resort, for a day or ro, or as long as is necessary, to the same means of relief. Some physicians try to discredit this system, and to sustain he fashionable empiricism of the day, by insisting that these medies produce the dark colored discharges simply by che-ical changes which they effect. There are two sufficient an-wers to this. 1. The substances mentioned are not capable of roducing such effects by chemical changes. 2. They produce hese effects just so long as there is the allegod disease to be moved, and no longer.

These are the principles by which Dr. Cooke offers health o the Clergy, and to all dyspeptics. The further elucidation of these principles, and their application to other forms of disease, must be left to the student of his works, and to the wisdom of the profession he adorned. Whenever the members of that learned profession will turn to the forgotten works of this great man, they will find there the materials, which, with the present vastly enlarged knowledge of therapeutic agents, may enable them to build up a firm, deep, and impregnable philosophy of Medicine.

Art. V.—THE CLERGY AND THE WORLD.

There is a singular perverseness in men, which will not allow them to regard the Clergy in any wise as they do their lay brethren. Most people treat their Minister as one far off from them; and, when associating with him, put off their every day manner, for one constrained, and quite as bashful as respectful. If this were merely in honor to his sacred calling, it might be well enough; but it is not so. It is rather the constraint of those who are in strange company; and has much of the sharp curiosity which is apt to beset men among unaccustomed objects.

The true position of a Clergyman among the Laity can be marked by no precise rules, as his intercourse with them must, in some measure, be guided by the congeniality or strangeness which he may find in their company. He will seek his friends as other men do. But, in the wide region of common courtesy and free intercourse, the people themselves often set at nought all efforts he may make to become at his ease with them. And there are many vulgar notions respecting the Clergy—vulgar in every sense—which create much evil, and which should be removed. These notions, however, are in some degree due to the Clergy themselves

That every one invested with this sacred Office should be preëminently a gentleman, few will question. The conduct of a true gentleman is but an embodiment of genuine Christian charity; and no one should surpass in it those whose lives are, or ought to be, guided steadily by its rules. But daily experience teaches us that the address of Clergymen is often frigid and distant to an unpleasant degree, when among strangers or those who are not on terms of intimacy with them. And this manner is assumed as the proper one, for a man whose duty it is to be not of the world, although he may be in it. While not designedly done with a Pharisaical spirit, it has marvelously the same appearance, and is therefore undeservedly credited with such a fault.

The result of this appears in those sermons which deal with sins as abstractions, and, week after week, rebuke covetousness, pride, and other monstrous vices, in the most zealous manner, and draw from the whole congregation expressions of admiration for their truth and earnestness, but leave the individual sin-

er untouched. All men are ready to decry any sin, and all cognize its enormity; but the deceitfulness of the heart keeps em from seeing their own features in its ugly countenance, unss plainly pointed out. But how can the preacher depict what e has never seen? The restraint of his presence not only eeps down the manifestations of evil dispositions, but banishes onversation on the topics which engross most worldly minds; nd instead of the honestly expressed views and opinions of hose whom he meets, he hears but the common phrases of ivility, more precise and common-place than usual. He sees o misconduct, therefore, except among those who are thorughly degraded. It is true he hears of a good deal. He ears the outpourings of talebearers and scandal mongers, who erform their duties by earnestly bewailing the sins of their eighbors, and in the process make them worthy of bewailing. And he cannot either utterly silence or disregard these reports. When he preaches, as he ought, with a view to reach the conciences of those who, as he supposes, are guilty of some especial besetting sin, he is therefore often entirely mistaken; and seing no change, he puts down as willful hardness of heart, hat is nothing of the kind. Unless he has a perilous gift of atory, which calls forth admiration and applause, he is rieved, as months roll on, to see so few touched by his proing, and repentant at his chiding. He bewails his own weakess, and mourns over the barren soil he is set to till. And arren indeed the soil remains, till some new laborer, with the dvantages of novelty, for a time accomplishes a little, and then ails like his predecessor. Both accomplish what they do by andom shots, and such will be sure to hit some wrongdoer in a ensitive place. But such is not the most profitable manner of reaching the Gospel.

No man can overcome evil, without knowing its manifestaons. As they vary with every new trick of deception, he hould be able to trace them through their windings, and deect them in all their disguises. This he can only do by seeing hem. The ways of men are not learned through books alone, ny more than the mechanic arts, or any other skillful work. Daily intercourse and constant observation are the only methds for learning man as he is, with all his imperfections and ontradictions. The Clergyman, like any other person, must et knowledge at that school where it is taught.

But this is deemed very unsafe practice by many, who, with over precision, regard all contact with the world as contaminating. And it must be confessed that this opinion is a very prevalent one. But what sort of sanctity is that which is de-

stroyed by the first touch of an erring fellow mortal? We are told that to be in the world yet not of it is the duty of the Christian. But what does this mean? Surely not that he should hold no intercourse with the world. Not that he should never be *in* the world at all. It is doubtless sinful to indulge in forbidden pleasures, but all pleasures are not sinful. It is likewise sinful to follow many pursuits from which pleasure is entirely absent. But to meet on terms of courtesy all with whom he may be thrown in contact, and to show them the beauty of Christian charity, as well as the honesty of Christian principle, can never contaminate any one.

> "He that has light within his own clear breast
> May sit i' th' centre, and enjoy bright day;
> But he that hides a dark soul, and foul thoughts,
> Benighted walks under the midday sun;
> Himself is his own dungeon."

This mistaken nicety is doing much, especially in our new settlements, to cast odium on the Ministers of the Church; and neither eloquence nor learning can do away with its evil effect. The rough freedom of manners and opinions prevailing is entirely antagonistic to any such weakness. Nowhere is an upright Clergyman more honored or respected for his firmness and consistency; but there are no keener critics of human nature than the settlers in a new country, and none more ready to detect mistaken notions of it. If the preacher betrays any greenness on this subject, and spends his time in belaboring sins that are not the peculiar failings of pioneers, he can hope for no great influence over his hearers or the community. They honor him for what he has, but do not recognize in him the guide and teacher they need. Plain and sound sense goes further with them than any flowers of rhetoric. They expect a leader to excel them in all that belongs to his calling, and also to be able to do his part in moulding the features of society. An old community, past the transition state, can get along with less difficulty. But, in a place where all are moving on, every leader must be able to hold his own, and keep in advance of the main body.

And if it be the object of the Ministry to call sinners to repentance, how are they to be called? Not, surely, by keeping aloof from them. The founders of our Faith went out daily among the people in the first beginnings of their Ministry. They preached to the unbelieving Jews, but they followed up their preaching by reasonings and less formal teachings. They did not keep aloof from the Gentiles, but among them, and in daily intercourse with them, they reached their stubborn hearts. And they preached to the needs of their hearers. St. Paul, on

he Areopagus, did not address the Greeks as he did the Jews n Palestine. To the Jews he became as a Jew, and to the Greeks as a Greek;—all things to all men. But, because he dapted himself to the tastes of the Greek, he did not assume he Greek vices. He gave them an example of what a Greek hould be when purged of those vices, and embracing a purer aith. He did not regard the best gifts of genius as unwor- hy a Christian because possessed by a heathen; but rather ought to turn them, by applying them to better uses, to the honor and glory of God. And the wise pastor, who goes among a people full of earnestness, and crowding with cheerful and bold hearts in the rough road of material advancement, in- tead of turning sadly from them as hard followers of Mammon, hould step manfully into the press, and with stout effort shoul- ler them, if need be, into the narrow way. Let him show him- elf *a man* that he may gain men.

In looking abroad among the Clergy who have succeeded in building up strong parishes, and those who have failed, we can- ot but notice how closely their career resembles that of men n secular pursuits. The merchant who brings goods unsuited o the market, fails, though their quality be perfect, and their prices all that could be desired. The lawyer, who cannot make the principles of the law fit the advancing wants of the age, and who walks *per antiquas vias legis*, over brush and corduroy, when others take the rail, is condemned to the de- sion that the modern Courts are all astray, while he only is ight. And the minister who bestows prize-essay learning nd metaphysical crotchets upon hearers who are in the habit f walking across lots to their point, instead of traveling or- erly on the windings of the King's highway, is apt to have is labor for his pains. One of the most successful parish lergymen we know anywhere, who has raised up into pros- erity and energy some of the most unpromising Churches to e found, would be very far from obtaining commendation for ulpit eloquence. But, with a mild and benevolent disposi- on, joined to an unfailing fund of shrewd common sense, and uiet perseverance, he makes men respect him for his virtue nd plain wisdom, and gives them confidence in his undertak- ngs for the Church, because he shows sound judgment in ther matters. If a man dazzles them with a sparkling dis- ourse, admirable for everything but its fitness to their case, hey are apt, when he proposes to build or enlarge a Church difice, and exhibits his plans and calculations, to hesitate at iving him their full confidence. But if when he is out of he pulpit, they find cause to respect his character and capac- ty, so that they would honor him though he were not ther

pastor, they will not only follow him in his plans, but they will find appreciation for very ordinary sermons. A man respected for his solid qualities is safe enough anywhere. Instances of the best ministerial success under difficulties could be readily pointed to, (were it not for provoking invidious comparisons,) and in each case there will be found some quality demanding the respect of all sorts of people, and improved by daily contact with them. A genial and affable temper, a plain straightforward honesty of speech and dealing, public spirit and enterprise—in short, some quality which will make its possessor a *useful member of society*—will never injure him for teaching religion. If he can exhibit to his flock, an example of how Christian graces may guide and purify worldly wisdom, his precepts will be far more honored.

It has always been remarked, that the Jesuit missionaries have usually had good success in establishing missions; and, if their missions have not been permanent, the fault is to be found in the system, and not in the qualifications of those who carry it out. It would be well if the good parts of their scheme were adopted by us; for in our own method we are sadly deficient. If we compare the course through which a young man enters parochial or missionary duty in our Church, with that which they go through with, the advantage in training, is clearly with them.

What would be thought of our Naval System, if a lad, after going through a Naval School, were to be placed at once in command of a ship of the line, before making a cruise? Yet this is, practically, what we do every day in the Church. A boy goes to College at the age of fourteen or fifteen, and at eighteen or nineteen graduates. If he has been intended for the Ministry, he may probably pass his College course in some institution, where sound learning and sound morals are cultivated, away from intercourse with the world;—and well for him if such has been his good fortune. He comes forth crowned with the laurel for his proficiency in the liberal Arts, among which a knowledge of mankind is not usually counted. Fresh from his studies, which have only qualified him for going to work, he enters a Theological Seminary, wherein is taught all proper doctrine, and likewise much discipline for the pulpit, but very little else. What is taught is good; but what is omitted is not all wisely omitted. At the end of his course he is ordained a deacon, licensed to preach, and sent as a Missionary to the West. He preaches sound and godly sermons, but not always practical; devotes himself honestly and earnestly to

ffice, as he understands them; and wonders

t the small results which follow his efforts, and pities the eathenish darkness of the people. He is not entirely wrong n estimating his success, for he cannot always see much fruit f his labors; although from being over-sanguine he becomes requently over-desponding. He is often entirely wrong about is people; for they are the same race who dwell in the old States, and are not unmindful of the requirements of religion. Why does he meet with such disappointments? Partly from not nowing, and partly from regarding as worldly matters unbeoming a minister, many things which are necessary to the well being of the community. He visits the farmer, and cannot converse with him on any of his familiar topics, or relish conversation on them. Of the current political news of the lay he is often studiously ignorant, because politics are notoriously an unclean pursuit. He visits a household where some member of the family, old or young, has met with an accident, or been taken suddenly ill, and, if appealed to for advice or assistance, is unable to give either. He visits the poverty-stricken with alms and sympathy; but cannot bestow such counsel as will aid them in making the most of their little means. He is asked advice concerning the disposition of property, perhaps on a death-bed, and can say nothing. In short, while by his sacred Office he is expected to be the general guide, counselor and friend, he is deficient in the essential qualifications.

The Jesuits do not neglect teaching the useful Arts. An acquaintance not superficial, but complete as far as it goes, with Medicine, Science, Languages, Agriculture and Mechanics, and the general principles of Law most likely to be of service, as well as the forms and rules of business, will be found very commonly among those missionary priests who are entrusted with cures of any importance. It is by such accomplishments that they obtain respect and influence among men, far more than by their dialectics. In the latter, wherein they follow the logic of the cloister, they are always sure to betray the disagreeable peculiarities of their system by the habitual use of puerile sophisms, effectual only with the ignorant and credulous. We have ourselves seen the readiness of these men to act in cases of emergency, where the nature of the accident was such as to baffle even a skillful physician; and the wisdom and common sense of the French priests who formerly had pastoral supervision of the Northwest, have always been known and appreciated. Their successors are not so accomplished; but they have a different work to do, and a different people to deal with than the simple and genial Frenchman.

We cannot but regard it as a great defect in our system that

more of this practical training is not found among our Clergy. It would not only add to their worldly wisdom, but would enable them to benefit their neighbors and parishioners. And—(which some, however, may not approve)—it would aid them in providing for themselves and their families more comforts, and render them more independent of "starvation-point" salaries half paid. It does not follow, of necessity, because a man learns to use the saw and plane, that he should take up the trade of a carpenter; nor because he has some knowledge of any other art, that he should devote himself to it. No knowledge comes amiss to a man of sense; and the disparagement which befalls a jack of all trades is undeserved, unless he is a master of none, and therefore has spent time on one which was needed for another. How far it is practicable, or convenient, for a parish Clergyman or Missionary to enter upon any secular trade or occupation, is a question deserving more time and space than a page in a desultory paper; but, having the example of St. Paul, who wrought diligently night and day to earn his own living, that he might not be chargeable to his flock, we believe there is a false etiquette on this subject which keeps many Clergymen miserably poor, and keeps many Churches destitute entirely of clerical supervision. We respectfully commend the consideration of this topic to those who are discussing the subject of "Free Churches."

Squeamishness is a vice very prevalent in this country, and there seems to be a great uneasiness about compromising the conventional dignity of station. Strange as it may appear, there is far more of this among ourselves than exists among the best society in England. Far be it from any one to undervalue a demeanor and course of life which not only receive, but extort from all, profound respect. But to encourage shallow-pated pretension to lay down iron rules for the conduct of the Ministry, and to starve it into genteel poverty, for no better recompense than a bland condescending approbation of the rigid propriety with which this etiquette is obeyed, is carrying obedience to worldly maxims entirely too far. It would astonish a dignitary of the Church of England, to be rebuked for farming or improving lands, or for owning a share in some flourishing factory. And it would seem equally strange to him to be told that, while his money was invested there, he should not keep an eye to its management. The English Clergy have in many noble instances been renowned for discoveries in science, and for well-directed labors in advancing the material interests of the community. It will not be found that these men, any more than the few of our own Clergy who have done

the same thing, have been for that reason remiss in their religious duties. But here, while we find fault with the ignorance of many of our Clergy on business matters, we at the same time find fault if they attend to business. We smile at their simplicity, and yet are shocked to see them civil to their neighbors, who have not the Shibboleth. And our tender care of them extends to their minds as well as their manners. Some of us are more horrified by the blooming out of a parson's imagination in sweet verse, or sparkling prose, which is not plainly didactic, than we should be to see him walking abroad with the small-pox. The Rector of Eversley, (who has in such vigorous English endeavored to point out that true religion should make men perform better everything they are called upon to do, and is purer and more sincere from union with active duties,) is looked at askance as a dangerous man, because he dramatizes his sermons, and thus is enabled to preach to larger congregations. And wo to the American divine whose pen drops honey, for he is sure to draw the wasps.

We have wandered over our ground without much regard to strict method. And, in what we have said, we design no ungracious reflections on any of the Clergy. They are eminently devoted and self-denying; and they desire to promote the honor of God and the good of men. But we believe they are too often called upon to labor a lifetime, to retrieve the disadvantages of imperfect—because partial—training, and to give up many opportunities for doing good, from mistaken notions in themselves and their people of what is becoming to the ministerial Office. And we have evidence enough, in those who have won the respect of men of all classes, by the union of Christian graces with useful knowledge, that the character of a pastor is never the worse for any part of manliness.

Art. VI.—FREE SEATS?—OR PEWS?

Free Seats and Pews have long been struggling together in the Church; and to many, the contest, even in argument, seems yet to be doubtful.

There has been, on the one side, perhaps an overstraining of particular principles; or too much of mere reliance on the private interpretation of some text of Scripture; or a somewhat curt dogmatism in assuming, as indisputable, the very point to be proved. On the other, there has been so great a quantity of dust thrown into the air, that it is difficult, at first, to distinguish between a Church and an auction-room; between an offering and a purchase; between giving an alms and paying rent. Yet when the matter is carefully reduced down to that which is of the *essence of the difference*, it will be found so plain, that the only wonder is, how Christian men, and sensible men, could ever raise any contest about it.

The first thing needful is, to disentangle the question from side issues, and considerations which may, indeed, (and most happily do,) modify the pew system as commonly carried out among us; but which have nothing to do with the *comparative* merits of the two systems, because they *belong equally to both*.

Thus it will not do for the advocate of Pews to urge, that frequently it is *not all* the pews that are rented; or, that a certain portion has been reserved by the Vestry as *Free Seats*. This will not do, we say; for the *principle* of renting *covers the whole*. The *character* of the Church as a "pewed Church" still remains. Probably the only reason a part is free, is because renters enough for all have not yet been found. And at any rate, the permanence of the arrangement is utterly unreliable. The vestry may at any time, by a majority vote, sell or rent the whole.

Besides—it is no argument for Pewed Churches, *as against Free Churches*, to say that, in the former, "*part* of the seats are free." Instead of an argument for Pewed Churches, this is really a fatal concession to their opponents; for if it be so good a thing to have *a part* of the seats free, *how much better to have the whole?* And again. If any particular proportion of seats in a Pewed Church are free—say one third—it is no argument against a Free Church: for in a Free Church, one-third of the seats are free also. Where there is no difference, there is no-

hing gained on either side, and nothing is to be argued either ray. The *real difference* is to be found in *the remaining two-hirds*, *all* of which are *free* on the one side, and *every one* of hich is *sold* or *rented* on the other. This plea in abatement, o loudly urged by the advocates of Pews, must therefore be t once ruled out of Court. It is rather too much to expect hat the Free Church system will consent to be struck down y *its own thunder*,—and *stolen at that.*

The modified practice dilutes the evils of the pew system, we rant, and thus renders its ordinary form as existing among us, omewhat less injurious. But the general admission of any uch dilution is itself a general confession, on the part of these ery Pewed Churches, that the evils of their own system were ntolerable without it. And their borrowing the remedy from he Free Church plan, is a confession that they *know* very well here to look for the best cure. In arguing, therefore, the omparative merits of the two principles of action, we must go pon the undeniable ground that *all* the seats in Pewed Churches are, or may be, *rented* or *sold*, just as in Free Churches, they are *all free.*

Again: There is no distinction worthy of the name of *principle*, to be taken between seats sold and seats rented. The former is *practically* much the worse of the two. But they are identical in essence. They differ only as the small pox and the varioloid differ. The latter is merely the milder and more manageable form of the disease.

Again: When we come to the question of the Offertory, and the duty of *giving*, as therein enjoined, it will not do to point to the large "plate collections" made in Pewed Churches on communion occasions, and for various Church or benevolent objects: for *these things are likewise done in precisely the same manner in Free Churches.* Their being done to some extent in Pewed Churches, is therefore no argument *against* the Free. It is only as before, an *unwitting concession.* For if it be good to raise a *part* of Church funds on these high and Scriptural grounds, how much *better* to raise *the whole* in that manner? *And Free Churches thus raise the whole.* This is only another specimen of the old trick:—taking an admirable, practical feature from those whom they are opposing, and then immediately turning round and using it as a weapon *against* the very system from which it was "borrowed."

Again: It is urged that "courtesy is always sure to give a seat to those who have no pews. Is "courtesy" confined to Pewed Churches? Is there no courtesy in Free Churches? Besides: That courtesy, as we all know from experience, cannot

always be relied on to make strangers at home in seats paid for by other people. It cannot safely be depended on even for well-dressed strangers—*gentlemanly* strangers—nay, nor yet for handsome and fashionable-looking "*ladies.*" And the meanly-clad poor? Let *them try it*, if they think there is invariable "courtesy" for *them!* They will soon find out their mistake! But even granting that "courtesy" occasionally, or even frequently, is found in Pewed Churches, and makes strangers "feel at home:" what argument is that *against* Free Churches, where that delightful "courtesy" is not left to depend upon the momentary caprice of individuals, but is the fundamental *law of the whole House?* If Christian "courtesy" is thus charming on a small scale, what must it be when made universal, so that *every* stranger may at *all* times "feel himself at home" in *any* seat he pleases?—Or is this "courtesy," in Pewed Churches, valued, like diamonds, *only because of its rarity?*—Here, again, it will be seen that the Pew-system has been compelled to steal another small pinch of Free Church salt, in order to give even the semblance of a savor to its own utter insipidity.

We do not wonder, indeed, at such adroit tactics. Realizing so thoroughly as we do, what a miserable, stale crust this vaunted pew system is, we do not wonder that its advocates cannot resist the temptation to purloin a little somewhat more toothsome to make their dry bread go down. Nor, considering the spirit in which their favorite system originated, are we at all surprised when we find them, like economical boarding-house keepers, spreading this sweet butter *as thin as possible*, to see if they cannot make a very little of it go a great way. All this, we say, occasions us no surprise. Their sapless system needs it so intensely, that the craving is irresistible. Indeed, they never consider themselves now-a-day as fit to be seen, except when they have covered their dust-colored coat with so many fresh-looking, Free Church patches, that they have great hope of preventing any discovery of the mean and coarse cloth it was originally made of.

But in fairly carrying on the contest between these two antagonistic systems, no such mixings and borrowings can be tolerated on the field of equal and honorable warfare. One champion has no business to come upon the ground buckrammed and padded out to imposing proportions, by what he has cribbed from his opponent on the sly. The contending principles on each side must be *stripped to the bare buff*, if we wish to see anything like *fair play.*

We therefore discard altogether the plea of "part free;" or, of "large offertory collections;" or, of "individual courtesy:"

as urged by the advocates of pews. These have no business in the controversy whatever, *except* as *virtual*, and *important*, and *overwhelming concessions in favor of the Free Church plan:* for these features, thus "borrowed" from that Free Church plan, are the only things that make the ugly face of the pew system tolerable, even to its own best friends.

Stripped to things essential, then, the two opposing schemes may be thus stated:—

The Free Church plan offers the preaching of the Gospel *free to all.* It asks no one to contribute for the "support of the Church," except such as have first *heard and received* the Gospel. It asks them to give *then*, only from their *faith* in God, their *hope* of Heaven, and their *love* both towards the Lord Jesus who hath given unto them salvation, and towards their brethren who are one with them in Him. And the standard of "how much" each one shall give, is no other than that which Holy Scripture has set forth,—"according as *he is able.*" In other words: the *free hearing* of the Gospel is a condition *precedent* to the duty of "*supporting the Church;*" and the *measure of that duty* is *God's Word.*

The pew system, on the other hand, does not offer the Gospel free to any; but furnishes it only to those who have paid for the privilege. It asks a certain rent for the "support of the Church," and asks it, not from Christian, but from commercial considerations, the seat being worth just as much "rent" to the Church whether its occupant love God or not. The standard "how much" each shall pay, is regulated solely by the prominence, convenience for seeing and hearing, and general "eligibility," of the pew, having nothing whatever to do with the "ability" of the giver. In other words: the *paying* for the "*support* of the Church," is a condition *precedent*, without which no man can expect to *hear the preaching of the Gospel;* and the measure of that duty is regulated by *the world.*

These are the points in which the two systems meet and contradict one another. And therefore it is within these limits, and on these grounds, and no other, that the contest between them must be fought out. In the above statement and definition, we have neither inserted anything outside the essential antagonistic issues, nor omitted anything important to their full comprehension. We have, it is true, given rather a large margin to the Pew-system, out of mere kindness. We shall be compelled to pare it much closer down to the quick, before we get through; but this will do to begin on.

Let us first try the question *historically*, relying upon the

saying of the wise man, "*The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be.*"

When the Holy Ghost descended on the day of Pentecost and the Apostles preached with tongues, and gathered in the first fruits of full grown Christianity, we find not a syllable in St. Peter's Sermon about the "duty of supporting the Church," as if *that* was the first thing to be provided for: but the *Resurrection of Christ Crucified* was the element of power with which his hearers were pricked to the heart. And when the converts said, "Men and Brethren, what shall we *do*?" the answer was not,—"We have sittings in our Upper Room, which we are about to rent. It is your duty to take pews there, at so much a year, that each one of you may keep his own family from contact with any other family during time of Divine Worship. And we will also have 'respect of persons,' so that the differences of your position in the world, may be carefully perpetuated in the Church. The richer, therefore, shall have the best seats, at the highest price; and the poorer shall have those not so desirable, at a lower price. Moreover, if we cannot rent the whole, there will be a few of the worst seats next the door, which may be occupied by paupers, and where they can hear the Gospel without money and without price." The Apostles, on the day of Pentecost, said nothing like this. If they had, the Gospel would have fallen still-born at the hour of its birth, and would never have been heard of after. Yet, on the Pew-system, this is substantially the first proclamation made when a new Church is built. The Consecration of the House of God is scarcely over,—the sound of the voice of the *successor of those Apostles who Preached on the day of Pentecost* has scarcely ceased to echo under its roof,—when the lay auctioneer enters, hammer in hand, and knocks down the seats to the highest bidder.

Nevertheless, the Church in Jerusalem was "supported," although it had not the aid of the Pew-system, which is now thought to be so indispensable. For several years the whole College of the Apostles abode there, and gave themselves wholly to the ministry of the Word and to Prayer; many of the Elders were also permanently laboring there; while seven Deacons were appointed and maintained besides, and employed more or less as Missionaries and Evangelists through all the region round; and large companies of "widows," moreover, both of Greeks and Hebrews, were daily ministered unto out of the treasury of the Church. No such powerful financial system has ever since been devised. Distribution was made to *every man*, according as he had need. And the Church *grew*. The

Lord added thereto *daily* such as should be saved. In a very brief space of time the number of them that believed was about *five thousand.* Now we would like to ask a question:—How long would it take for a parish of an hundred and twenty members to grow to *five thousand*, supporting *Twelve* Apostles, a *large company* of Elders, and *seven* Deacons, besides distributing to all the needy,—*on the Pew-system?*

This wonderful growth of the Church in Jerusalem is an epitome of Church growth everywhere else, and ever since. Never, on the face of the whole earth, has the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ *first* bargained for a temporal maintenance, and *then* proceeded to minister unto the souls of the perishing the treasures of heavenly Grace. Throughout all the Roman Empire the voice of *Free* Grace was freely heard. Whether in the Jewish Synagogues, or the open market place, or the upper chamber, or the private hired house, or the lonely seashore, the unbroken law of *freedom* was everywhere the same. And it was in a great measure *because* the millstone of Mammon was *not* hanged about the neck of the glorious Gospel, that its innumerable enemies were utterly unable to drown it in the depths of the sea. From city to city it ran, with unshackled, mysterious, electrical speed. Province after province was overrun with the sacred contagion. No tax nor tariff checked its course from mouth to mouth, from heart to heart. Even the enormous boundaries of the Roman Empire were not enough to exhaust its energy of conquest; but it overflowed on all sides, and carried the rivers of salvation afar off into places inaccessible to Roman arms, making the wildernesses and solitary places of barbarism to blossom as the rose. Not alone during the lives of Apostles, during the ages of miracles, during the bloody seed-time of martyrdoms and pagan persecutions, was this the universal mode of the growth of the Gospel throughout the nations. Even during the gathering darkness of the Middle Ages, this grand old inviolable Tradition of Christianity was handed down from century to century, uncontaminated by the touch of filthy lucre. Whether obscurely exploring the vast labyrinths of Tartaric tribes in the interior of Asia, or winning a wide yet transient domain in the Flowery Empire, or breaking the coarse idols of the English Saxons, or subduing the rough Gothic tribes of Europe, or softening the more fiery hordes of Sarmatian blood, or lighting up the gloom of the black forests of Germany, or melting the savagery of Scandinavian sea-kings, or fertilizing deeply the cold clay of Russian serfdom: everywhere the same invariable watchword has invariably led the warriors of the Cross to victory. The

preaching of the Gospel was *free to all comers.* No *price* was ever charged anywhere in the whole world, as *first* to be paid, *before* the preaching of the Gospel should be even *heard.* Rich or poor, Jew or heathen, publican, heretic, hypocrite or harlot —all were welcome to come and hear the words of life, without first *hiring a pew.*

"But," it may be said, "times and men have changed since then. That plan did well enough in those countries and for those ages of the world. But the Nineteenth Century needs a different mode of proceeding, and men must now be wrought upon by different and more practical methods."

Our appeal, be it remembered, is now not so much to principles in the abstract, as to the *actual history of the Church.* We are arguing, not on private interpretation of Scriptural texts, nor on philosophical considerations, nor on theoretical hypotheses. *We are building only upon notorious and indisputable facts.*

And on the ground of notorious *fact*, this alleged "change of times and circumstances," we boldly deny. It is no such thing. The phrase is empty—it is a mere delusion and a snare. For how is the Gospel propagated in this our day? Where has it spread at all, with a solid and *bona fide* growth? Let us look closely at it and see.

During this Nineteenth Century thus far, the Gospel has made conquests of no small magnitude in India, in Africa (both on the West coast and at the Cape,) in New Zealand, in Australia, and in these United States, besides a most wonderful revival within these twenty years in England. If we go beyond the bounds of our own communion, and somewhat further back than the opening of this century, we find the great phenomenon of Methodism sweeping onward with a breadth and force truly astonishing, the Whitefield revival, the rapid rise of the Baptists, the successful missions of various bodies of Dissenters in India, in Burmah, in the Sandwich Islands and those of the South Pacific, and elsewhere. *What had the Pew-system to do with any one of these?* Did Wesley make people pay pew rent *before* he would allow them a chance to be "converted?" Are East Indians first required to pay for the support of Missionaries, *before* they are persuaded to destroy their hideous idols, and turn to the living God? Are the dusky New Zealanders, or the coal-black Africans, *first* brought up to the contribution-box, *before* the Gospel has taught them to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins?" All these senseless absurdities are necessarily involved in the Pew-system, which requires people to *pay* (or promise to pay) *beforehand a cer-*

tain price, after which, and *in consideration* of which, they are entitled to hear "the stated preaching of the Gospel."

Nor is the Church movement in England, or the spread of the Church in this country, any exception to the universal experience of all the rest of Christendom. One great leading feature of the movement in England,—one chief element of its power, and of its success—has been its deadly hostility to the Pew-system, and the remorseless and unflinching war which it has waged with pews, and pew sales and pew rents, in every varied form of the abomination. The measure of popular growth among the masses has been in direct proportion with the successes gained in this war against the heartless exclusiveness of pews. Without this, that movement would have been strangled in its infancy. With it,—that is *with* this large *destruction* of the Pew-system—the Church of England has grown more, in numbers, church buildings, schools, and voluntary offerings of all sorts, for all purposes ecclesiastical and benevolent, foreign and domestic,—she has grown incomparably more, we say, in *twenty-five years*, than in the *three hundred years previous*.

In these United States, the Church has spread very rapidly, indeed, though not near so rapidly as she might have done on a more scriptural, more sensible, and more powerful plan. The Pew-system has prevailed to a very general extent, in almost every quarter of our land. In some Dioceses the common rule has been to sell the pews in fee, so that they might pass, like so much bank stock, into the hands of schismatics, heretics, or even infidels. Such owners charge rent to the occupants of their pews, but pocket the whole as they would the rent of a house. Not a cent of it goes to the "support of the Church:" the minister's salary, meanwhile, being paid by voluntary subscription. In other, and the more numerous, cases, the less injurious mode of annual renting has been preferred. The *dilutions* we have spoken of have also very extensively been resorted to, thus giving much more of life to the total than the Pew-system could ever rightly claim as its own. And yet our *growth* has been sadly hindered. The Church has often, through large sections, felt the tone of her system somehow impaired, and has suffered severely without knowing or suspecting what it is that hurts her. Look at the veteran time-honored citadels of the Pew-system,—the old and old-fashioned pewed Churches—how hard and dry they are! There is no more elasticity, life or growth in them, than in an ancient oyster-shell. They can run on in the old ruts, but they are perfectly certain that ruin will overtake the Church, if those old ruts

should ever be departed from. These are not the Parishes, nor are such the men, to lead the van of the Church's conquests. No. After waiting year after year until our very souls are weary,—and waiting in vain,—for such men to *move on:* it is at length agreed, on all hands, that not among the old pewed churches, but in its *Mission-work* is the true *Life of the Church.* The time for the moving in the Valley of Dry Bones, is not yet.

And what is the operation of *Life* in this Mission-work? How does it act? By what method is the Church *first started* in a *new* place? Do men begin with the Pew-system full fledged? They are not such fools. Arrangements are invariably made whereby the multitude of strangers to the Church may first attend freely. There is not a lisp about pew-rent. Seldom is even the plate passed round *after* preaching. *Free seats* are the lure, whereby to get men to come within the sound of the preacher's voice. *Free seats* are relied on to fill the room; and without them, a beggarly account of empty benches would be the sole reward of the admirer of pews.

True, it is too generally the case, that when a good beginning has been made on the Free system, the congregation, of its own accord, adopts the other. *That* part of the question we shall consider presently. We only wish to show *now* that the beginning is made, and must be made, invariably on the *free* plan. Take, for instance, a case mentioned only a few weeks ago in the *Episcopal Recorder.* Christ Church, Dupont's Mills, Delaware, was started in 1851, and has now one hundred communicants. An humble school-house has all this while served them for a church,—*seats free,* of course. They have now mpleted a beautiful Gothic stone Church, 120 feet long, with a spire 140 feet high, and a fine organ, &c. All this has been done in *five years,* with *free seats. Now,* however, the people are so eager for pews, that they were nearly all taken before the Church was completed. The *Recorder,* with strange unconsciousness of the bearing of its words, remarks upon this case, that, "Without in any degree shaking our confidence in the *free* system as *the first stage in a missionary enterprise,* it seems to indicate, with an unusual degree of clearness, the period in which it seems desirable to change the *free* into a *pewed* church." The *Recorder* is too profound for us to fathom its occult philosophy of what is "desirable." To our common-sense way of looking at things, it would seem that a system which had gained 100 communicants and built a beautiful stone Church, in five years, to *begin with,* was precisely the best system in the world to *go on with.* But more of this here-

r. We here have at least the broad admission that the "free em" is the true plan for "the first stage in a Missionary rprise;" that is, that the "free system" is the *only system* n which *true Missionary work can be effectively carried on ll.*

he uncontradicted voice of all history and all experience, nitive, Mediaeval, Modern, European, American, is there- this, that in carrying forward Christianity, men are not to xpected, or asked, to *pay in advance* for the Gospel, in order ; thus it may be preached to them; but that, to gain any foothold anywhere, it must first be *preached* FREE. And is equally true everywhere, and in all places, and in all s, from the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem, down to the hest western settlement in these United States, in the mid- of this nineteenth century; or to the remotest islands in South Sea.

Laving now found what the *Facts of History* tell us about e Seats, let us consult the same incorruptible oracle about vs.

Ve imported the system from England. Occasionally, from at the time of the Reformation or a little before, the Lord he Manor, on building a Church all by himself, and retain- the patronage in his own hands, would erect a large pew in ominent position, for his own family; leaving, however, all rest of the Church perfectly free, as of ancient and univer- ustom. When Puritanism began to prevail, and men were ing neither to bow in the creed nor kneel in the prayers, r began to build the backs and sides of Church seats r high, that these indulgences of stiff-necks and stubborn- ss might pass undiscovered. As sermons were also of very risome length in those days, these new-fangled boxes were irably contrived, so that, during the discourse, the whole gregation might sink down behind the tall pew-backs into in- bility and slumber. The exclusiveness of this system more more shut out the masses from the Parish Church. The wealth- and most respectable families had possession of the pews— respectability of the family being generally measured by the of the great pew, and the amount of lumbering furniture, re, table, settees, and stools, which it contained. The system w harder and harder, the more it flourished. The great body he excluded were too ignorant to know that all this was a vi- tion of English law; and too poor, and of too little social sideration, to be able to enforce their legal rights, even if they d known them. The ale-house and the cock-fight, therefore, re the only Sunday solace for *them*, until some ranting

Dissenter came along, holding forth by the roadside—*where there were no pews;* or in the "Chapel," or "Bethesda," or "Ebenezer," where *all the seats were free:* and thus stole away the hearts of the people from the Church of their fathers!

So far, the results of this miserable innovation—this shameless usurpation, this misbegotten spawn of spiritual pride and social superciliousness—were only evil, and that continually. The clergy were supported, not by pews, but by tithes; and whether their churches were full of worshipers, or only full of pews, made little difference in their income. As for those who had pews, they, of course, paid nothing for the privilege, the Churches being, *by law*, free to all. A new refinement was, the idea of *renting* seats for *money*. This was of course illegal in the parish Churches, but it was practicable in proprietary Chapels—that is, Chapels which were the private property of one or more individuals. These Chapels, if served by a clergyman who was popular enough as a preacher to draw large congregations, were found to be a good speculation. The pew-rents would suffice to pay the minister, and the current expenses, and a handsome per centage on the invested capital besides. This unhappy development *doubly riveted all the mischief of the former abuse.* It made the *income of the Clergy* depend upon the pew system, thus making them interested in continuing it: and besides that, it made the people feel that they were not merely illegal "squatters" and usurpers of other persons rights; but it gave them the proud consciousness that they had "paid" for their seats, and had "a legal right" to get "the worth of their money" in return. This of course made them even less likely to grant, than the Clergy were to ask, a change.

And such is the shape in which the evil has become general among us. Its supposed financial certainty and convenience; its facility for keeping families together; its securing a *quid pro quo*, as the something gained for a man's own self in return for the amount he gives to the Church; all these are urged, and urged powerfully, by clergy and by laity, in its behalf.

The certainty is imaginary: for the pew-rent is as likely to be in arrear as any other Church money—so experience testifies. But at any rate, the Church has always been more liberal on the right system than the wrong, and is even now ready to become so again, as we shall show presently.

Its convenience is a deceptive plea, as hundreds of parish treasurers can tell, who from the unpleasant reminiscences of years know how much more laborious, and in every way disagreeable, it is to dun delinquents for unpaid pew-rent, than simply to carry the Alms-basin round on Sunday morning.

[ts facility for keeping families together is a Euphuistic de-
ɔtion. It means in reality, that the hiring a pew of one's
n renders punctuality unnecessary; and enables a man, with
fe and children, to make a most irreverent and inexcusable
ɹption into the congregation in the midst of public worship,
d yet be perfectly certain that their pew will be *kept empty*
· *them until they arrive.* It is very rarely that, on coming
Church betimes, a family of moderate size will find any dif-
ılty in securing seats together. And for the few times dur-
; the year when it may be otherwise, what is the real differ-
ɔe? For the most part, one seat's distance is the furthest re-
ıve required. And is this so great a matter? One might
ɹpose that even a young new-married couple, while yet
ır honey-moon was at the full, might consent to sit some
ɐ *feet apart*, and endure this limited absence even for an
ır and a half, without being rendered altogether inconsola-
by the cruel separation. Nothing, indeed, proves the emp-
ɐss of the advocates for pews more glaringly, than the amount
noise they make about this "separation of families." Those
ıo have practised the system find no serious trouble from any
these things, which are such formidable hobgoblins in the
agination of those who are determined *not* to practise it.
Many reasons indeed, might be given for the powerful hold
ich this particular bugbear has taken on the fancy of some
ɹple: but it will suffice to notice the two most powerful. In
ɜ country of legal equality, the only chance of securing a
ɔsition" in society, is by the union of public display with
ial exclusiveness. A pew in an eligible part of a Church
ɐs a certain position of respectability among respectable
ɹple, especially if it is handsomely upholstered and furnished
h richly-bound books. And the legal right to *keep other*
ple out of it, is absolutely indispensable to the full enjoy-
nt of those who have paid for the right to be in it. The other
ınd perhaps stronger—motive, is, the instinctive rebellion
"respectable" fallen human nature against that great truth
ich proves the power of the Incarnation,—that "there is neith-
Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither
le nor female," but we "are all one in Christ Jesus." Re-
ctable baptized sinners, in broadcloths and silks, do not like
feel as if they were "all one," in any sense, with other bap-
ɜd sinners in homespun and calico: and therefore they pre-
to keep the less respectable sinners on the other side of a
ıt plank, in a pew by themselves, or on a hard bench in the
ɔy, or somewhere far behind them down by the door. These
ɔ are the main roots out of which this great tree of difficul-

ty grows. The less said about the "separation of families," therefore, the more certainly will that objection receive *all the attention it deserves.*

The argument based upon the *quid pro quo* is now all that remains. And we freely own that there is something in it. But that something utterly destroys the new claim so loudly set up, that pew-rent is to be reckoned as an alms, and as having quite as much of the nature of an "offering" and of "sacrifice" as if it had actually been laid upon the altar of pure free-will. We, however, must be permitted to insist upon it, that *quid* is *quid*. The man who rents or buys his seat, pays for something, and gets something for his money. It will not do to say, "He only gets the occupancy of a seat; and *that* he would have at any rate on the Free Church plan: so where's the difference?" This will not do, we say: for we are now considering that argument in favor of pews, which urges that "men are more willing to pay towards the support of the Church when they *get something* for their money." They therefore *get* something: and it will not do to avoid our reply by turning round in the same breath and protesting that they *get nothing* after all. Will they confess that the pew-system squeezes money out of people on false pretences?—that it swindles? No. That will not do. They *get something*. And the fact of their *getting something* is just the difference between an alms and a *bargain*. If a poor man comes to Mr. John Smith for help, Mr. John Smith may have the kindness to make him a present of twenty dollars. But suppose that, not being minded to so large generosity, he says to the poor man, "I can't afford to *give* you the money; but if you have a mind to part with that cow of yours, I'll let you have twenty-five dollars;" and the poor man consents: who would say that John Smith had *made him a present* of the twenty-five dollars? Since he *got something for his money*, it was not a present, but a *bargain*—a good bargain or a bad bargain, according to the worth of the cow: but in either case a bargain—and nothing more than a bargain.

Nor will it do to say that "the *occupancy of the seat* is *the same in either case.*" We have a right to walk in a public park, and sit on a bench under the trees all day long if we like, and nothing to pay for the privilege, because it is a Free Park—public property. But suppose that we take such a fancy to one particular part of the park, that we wish to have it for our own, and be able to keep other people out of it, what then? If we can succeed in being allowed to purchase, will it not cost us a pretty penny? And even if, after we get it, we do not build on it, but only sit on the bench and enjoy the shade as

re did before; can it be asked with any common sense, 'Where's the difference?" We have *bought and paid for the right to keep other people out*, who before that purchase, had *as good a right there as we*. This exclusiveness is of the essence of all property. A man's house would not be his own house if other people had as good a right to use it as he had himself. It is his own, because he can *keep all others out of it*. His field is his own field, not so much because he can do in it what he will, as because no other man can set foot in it against his will, without committing a trespass. No area can be common property and private property at the same time. The essence of common property consists in the fact that no one man has any more right there than another, and none can therefore exclude another. The essence of private property is, that some one man has *more* right there than anybody else, and can *exclude* all others if he pleases. It is this exclusiveness, and this only, which makes a *pew of their own* so sweet a morsel under the tongue of those who "always like to *get something for their money*."

And yet we are gravely told that this price, thus willingly paid for the right to keep other people out of a pew, and which would not be willingly paid under any other consideration, is to be reckoned as an "offering of a pure heart" unto God; and the treasurer of the parish—so it is hinted—after collecting the pew rents, may keep them in his pocket until Sunday morning comes, and then place them in the alms basin, and have the prayer for the Church Militant said over them on the altar! If the Pew-rent is *alms*, what is to be said of the cost of the pew-carpet and cushions, and morocco-bound books with gilt clasps, and all other furniture of the pew? These sums, we suppose, on the private cash-book, will be charged to the "*Charity account*,"—that sort of *Charity*, which begins at home, and ends there, without ever being seen or heard of elsewhere. It would need but a slight extension of the same principle to include the cost of all the Sunday dresses of the family. Why not? They are for "Sunday" use, and to be worn "to Church;" surely they might just as well be reckoned on the "Charity account," also. And thus a skillful accountant may cypher up no very inconsiderable amount of charity in the course of a year,—a mode which none, however, are likely to adopt except those whose annual "total" on the charity account would otherwise be but a cypher. This new mode of calculating "charity" would be, indeed, valuable, if by thus making it stretch more suprisingly than caoutchouc, it could only be induced thereby to cover the greater multitude of sins. We cannot help, in this connection,

inquiring, whether a charity of this generously expansive sort would not suit those, upon whose "religious sensibilities" the "chink of the money" given at the offertory "falls as disagreeably as the tap of the auctioneer's hammer." It is a very characteristic symptom of the deep perversion which taints the whole system, that under its debasing and debilitating influence, that very act which God has ordained whereby to sanctify to us the possession of property, should actually come to be regarded as a *desecration* of the pure spirituality of His worship! Surely, such "sensibilities" have been refined to the most penurious point of delicacy; and we should not wonder, some fine day, to hear that religion of so exquisitely attenuated a texture "had died of a rose in aromatic pain."

But the worst feature of this popular plan of supporting the Gospel is, that it furnishes selfish men with a very plausible "dodge" for shirking a duty which is proclaimed in Scripture, and reëchoed constantly by the Church, in tones as loud, and terms as plain, as language can make them. Men are required to *give unto* God *according to the ability* that God *hath given* them. The *ability of the giver* is the standard of God's word, and, therefore, the standard of Free Churches. The Pew-system takes as *its* standard, not a man's ability; but the nearness of his pew to the chancel or the door, as the case may be; or, whether it be in the middle alley, or a side alley, or behind a pillar, or in the gallery. Is *this* the standard for "charity"!—for "alms"!—for "an offering unto God of a sweet savour"! We trow not! This standard has about as much to do with "charity," as the standard by which a seat in the parquette of a theatre may be had at one price; a place in the boxes at another; and a ticket to the amphitheatre at less than either. Yet this miserable "standard," which regulates all that is done on the Pew-system for the support of the Church, wretched and mean as it is, acts like an opiate on the conscience, and blinds it to all further seeing of that standard which is divine. It covers a man up from the power of Holy Scripture, and of Scriptural preaching, as a water-proof cloak covers him up from the rain. Sitting comfortably in his cushioned pew (for which the rent has been duly paid and charged to "charity account,") the solemn reiterations of the Offertory glide by him unheard, or enter in at the one ear and go out at the other; or at most, whenever they rub roughly on some spot yet left sensitive in the deadening soul, they stimulate him only to drop a dollar bill—or even a five-dollar bill—into the plate at some casual collection, instead of the usual twenty-five cents. Whereupon the poor man goes home with as much of a glow

s bosom as if he had been *liberal* that day. And yet, poorly ey are, for the most part, responded to, the Church is deeply ted to these extra-parochial collections, and private ap- for aid; for they breathe a little Free-church life and love a system that has none of its own. Without this portion r ordinary operations shining before men, there would be, e working of the Pew-system, only light enough to make kness visible."

e standard of the *world* being thus set up in the Church ; to the exclusion of the standard unfolded in *the Word of* the question naturally arises, "How can the Pew-system efficient for "the support of the Church?" This is its reat boast,—that it "supports the Church;" and that it he only plan on which the Church can be supported." If claim be true, then the Church ought to be better sup- d in this country than in any other; because in this coun- he Pew-system is more generally adopted than in any . Let us look at *facts* once more.

e Church in Jerusalem had all things common,—but the dance of this support did not come from pew rents. aurence, at Rome, fed 1500 widows and poor from the ures of the Church, but there were no pews rented in those in St. Peter's. From thenceforward, in many lands, the y have been many times more numerous than with us; often been rolling in wealth, living in palaces, vested in and velvets, purple and fine linen, and rich in silver and and precious stones; Bishops have been barons and prin- and received the revenues of principalities: but all this e no man had yet invented pews. In England, pews have m brought in any revenue, except in Proprietary Chapels among some of the Dissenters; while the wealth of the ch—such as it is—comes partly from tithes, and partly landed endowments—the present remnant of the real es- given by the piety of individuals in former generations, of the *whole* of which the Church has *not yet* been plun- l by the State. But surely *this* country must make a r showing. This country, where the Pew-system is more ral than it has ever been in any other, must certainly port the Church" better than was ever done elsewhere. really think so? Then open your ears, and hear *the land reëchoing, from one end to the other, with doleful laints as to the starvation point of support* which is the *al result* of the generally adopted PEW-SYSTEM? Let two notorious facts—the general pew-system, and the ral *starvation* "support of the clergy"—stand up

cheek-by-jowl together,—where they belong. Let any man deny either the one or the other of them,—if he dare. Let him prove that the one does not *account* for the other,—*if he can.*

The testimony of History as to the *facts* of the two systems, is now, we trust, sufficiently clear. To measure their full significance, however, we must go below the facts, to ascertain the *great and leading principles* which are embodied in them. In no other way can we fairly and fully bring the two systems up, broadside against broadside, to try their metal with one another.

In the history of the Creation of the world, when we read of the making of Man, male and female, there is immediately added the first great law of humanity as given to the first Adam: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." And when the second Adam came to redeem that humanity which had fallen under the first, the great law of the new creation was the perfect parallel to that of the old. The Church which is Christ's Body, was by Him commanded to "Go and teach *all nations*,"—"Go ye into *all the world* and preach the Gospel to *every creature*." The Ministry were sent forth to be catchers of men; not to organize a system which would keep the greater part of them from all chance of being caught. St. Paul, in the true spirit of a Fisherman, was all things to all men, that by all means he might gain some. Christ died for *all* men, and it was the business of the Church to bring this saving Gospel home to *all* men. Therefore, "*Come ye*," is the universal invitation. The volume of Holy Writ closes its tremendous appeals to men with this its latest voice,—one which was intended to reëcho without ceasing until the dawning of the Day of Judgment:—"The Spirit and the Bride say, *Come*. And let him that heareth say, *Come*. And let him that is athirst, *Come*. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life *freely*." And with such invitations thus given, it is no wonder that the Lord *added* to the Church *daily* such as should be saved;—no wonder that nations flocked to the Ark of God, as doves to their windows. To increase, to multiply, to grow, to gain, to gather in—this is the chief work the Church is ordained to do. She is the great treasure-house of God's grace, and she must draw all men unto her, that they may receive of Christ and be saved. Growth by the Spirit; growth by the Bride; growth by the Ministry; growth by the voluntary labors of the laity; growth by the spontaneous coming of "whosoever will," that he may take the water of life *freely*: this is the one prime, all-controlling, all-

whelming instinct, the indispensable and ineradicable *law* e, to the Church of the living God. This must be obeyed no matter what else may be postponed or neglected. It is ssible that any *practical* consideration can ever, under any mstances, be for an instant weighed against it. What- clashes with this, therefore, must be done away. What- impedes it must be cut asunder. Whatever smothers out ife of it, must itself be destroyed.

e Pew-system, on the contrary, says "Come" to nobody, ɔt to those who have bought or rented pews. The essence is not, as we have already shown, in obtaining the right to seat, for *that* exists equally on the other plan: but its essence it gives, for money, the right to *keep other people out* of t. The legal right to *exclude*, is the soul of the system. ɔoldly appeal to the experience of every Rector of a large "successful" pewed Church, who "has not a single pew is not rented," whether his attempts to get the poor and y to come to Church have not been almost wholly paralyz- the impossibility of getting over the repugnance of these le to "intrude" into "other people's seats." Poor folks ıot thrust themselves upon that "courtesy" which, even utter no rude word, yet constantly greets them with a hat says, as plainly as any tongue could speak: "What ess have *you* here? This is not *your* pew!"

ıd the strong tendency of the system to promote *staying* , operates largely even on those who take pews. Every ɔr of a pewed Church knows how common it is for heads of ies habitually to absent themselves from the worship of hurch. They *pay* for a pew; and then, satisfied that they done their share for "the support of the Church," they ıs if they had a right to be absent as much as they please. , even when the pews are all "taken"—except the preacher ıe occasion be an extraordinary attraction—they are on erage *not half filled*. "There is room," indeed, as truly r pewed Churches as in the King's Festal Hall at the iage Supper, yet the hungry crowds in the streets and of the city, instead of being "compelled to come in," are ully *kept out*. In vain does the patient and laborious Cler- ın say, *Come*. In vain do the Spirit and the Bride say, . The pew system, like Satan under the tree in Paradise, dently contradicts the Spirit and the Bride, and, with blooded yet eager mercilessness, reiterates, in hoarse yet etic whispers of indignant selfishness: "*Stay away! stay !*"

ınce it follows, as a matter of course, that while the Free

Church plan is a full embodiment of that first great law of the Church's life—*growth*—the pew-system has never been so much as suspected of any such tendency. Not even the most fanciful or the most ingenious of its many advocates, has ever hinted that the pew system was a valuable auxiliary in a *Missionary* enterprise, or an efficient ally in carrying on the Church's conquests from the domain of the world, the flesh and the Devil. It is much more powerful in bringing a *kind* of worldliness *into the Church*, than in converting worldlings to a life of Faith. So long as there is any stomach for vigorous conquest for the Church, free seats carry the day. When conquests are over, when no further growth is looked for, and when a congregation is ready to repose from past toils and payments, and begin respectably and comfortably to *stagnate* [illegible], as the Rector expresses it, "it seems desirable to change the [illegible] into a *pewed* church." Certainly; by all means. The pewed Church is incomparably *better to stagnate* in, than the [illegible]. That process may there be carried on without any fear of serious disturbance: for in that system not a pulse beats, not a nerve thrills, not a fibre of its frame can feel, in any true sympathy whatever, with that which is the FIRST GREAT LAW of life in the Church.

There are difficulties, of course, in the working of the Free Church system, as [illegible]; and they are worthy of a full and patient investigation, which we may hope to give them at some [illegible]. Among these is the difficulty of maintaining [illegible] a recognised and tangible connection between [illegible] and the people of the flock. Another [illegible] and administer [illegible] conversion. The full [illegible] valuable, could [illegible] matters of subordinate [illegible] with them now.

[illegible] abstract principles [illegible] a few details, [illegible]

[illegible] is the newest of the [illegible] on the Free [illegible] worshipping at [illegible] meeting [illegible] existence [illegible] exchanging [illegible] furnishes are [illegible] have been in favor with their flocks and their Lord, and have had not a sin-

gle one of the obstacles to contend with, that have embarrassed the progress of the Advent. Yet the latter has run ahead of them all, having now 406 Communicants; and the offertory for the past year has yielded $9,620.23,—about $23.70 for each Communicant. Nearly the whole congregation is largely made up of people of moderate means, and *mostly of the poor.*

The Church of the Holy Communion, New York, occupies so prominent a place in the list of Free Churches, that it ought to be mentioned here in order to remove popular misapprehensions, if for no other reason. It has been stated that it is composed mainly of the rich. This is a gross error. Of its 250 Communicants, only a little more than one tenth belong to that class. About four tenths belong to the middle class; and fully one half to the *poor.* The average of the Offertory for several years has been about $3,000 for parochial purposes, and about $4,000 for Missions and other Church objects: an average of $28 for each Communicant. This $7,000 a year, however, is *exclusive* of all that has been done for St. Luke's Hospital, and for the admirable Institutions and operations more immediately connected with that Church. What all these would amount to, we have not been able to ascertain; but so far as our limited knowledge can trace the truth, the total would be at the least between *three and four times as much.* What the sum really is, God only knows. And when to all this is added the influence this Church has had, in promoting the beauty and the true devotional Spirit of our Services among all classes of Churchmen, and in quickening and multiplying the labors of love now so vigorously pushed onwards in so many quarters: we may well say, that of all the Churches among us, there are few that we could not better afford to lose.

In Grace Church, Albany, Communicants 90; one third of them poor, just able to live; not a single man of wealth in the congregation. Offertory for last year $1,377.83:—average for each communicant $15.31. This is a larger proportion than prevails in St. Paul's, (a fashionable pewed Church in the same city,) even *counting in the pew-rents as so much alms.* In Holy Innocents, in the same city, the proportion to each of 110 Communicants is about $12, the congregation being largely composed of British immigrants of the laboring class. The same is the average in Holy Innocents, New York. In St. Paul's, Newark, $13. In Christ Church, Vicksburg, $16.66. In the Church of the Advent, Brownsville, Texas, $50. *There are no pewed Churches in the land, with congregations of similar character, and under similar circumstances in other respects, which equal, much less surpass, these proportions.*

When a worse system has been so long in use in this country, and when habits of stinginess towards religion have been so deeply ingrained in every rank of society, it takes a long while before the results of a new system can be made to do justice to its inherent strength. But with the beginning already so well made, and such wholesome examples before his eyes, no faithful and laborious man need any longer believe that it is the pew-rents only that keep him above (or *at*) the starvation point. This is a very tolerable degree of success, even as the advocates of pews reckon success,—in *dollars and cents.*

But the great triumph of the free system is in the character and composition of the congregations. We have been called "the Church of the Rich" long enough. The time is rapidly coming,—and Free Churches are nobly hastening it,—when this will sink from the dignity of a reproach against us, into the turpitude of a slander. Free Churches attract all classes, and in *very fair proportions.* They do not skim off the rich cream of the social dish: but high and low, rich and poor, one with another, here pray and praise the Lord side by side. The Church of the Advent, Boston, has worshipers of every kind, in fair proportion,—few of rich, more of moderate means, and most of poor. The proportions in Holy Communion, New York, we have already given. Grace, Albany, as we have mentioned, has no man of wealth; some few professional men; and only 12 or 13 families able even to keep a servant. Holy Innocents, Albany, mainly British laborers. Ascension, Frankfort, sees the Governor of Kentucky often worshiping in the seat next to a laboring man. St. John's, Louisville, Kentucky, Communicants 150, principally from the poorer classes and those in moderate circumstances,—clerks, mechanics, foundrymen and sempstresses. Holy Cross, Troy, Communicants 150, in moderate circumstances, except about twelve individuals who may be called rich. Grace Church, Petersburg, Virginia, Communicants 185, two-thirds of them from the laboring population. St. James,' Syracuse, Communicants 100, from all classes, a majority of them persons in very moderate circumstances. Brownsville, Texas, of all classes. Key West, Communicants 98, mostly from the poor, and from the Methodists, though some of the first men of the place belong to the Church also. St. Johns', Lancaster, is a remarkable specimen of the energy of the Free Church system. By its means, a congregation of 2 to 300 in the morning, and some 500 in the evening, mainly poor, systematically worship God and hear the Gospel preached unto them, where, on the pew-system it would have been ridiculous to attempt anything. It is all clear conquest.

he Old Church was abundantly sufficient for all the "Epispalians" in the place. But perhaps, as a classified illustraon, the analysis given of the 61 Communicants in the Church f the Holy Innocents, New York, although a young and as et feeble enterprise, will give as good an example as any, of ie way in which the Free Church plan penetrates all the *stra*a of society, taking its largest proportions from the lower, hich are always the more numerous, classes:—

Retired from business,	6
Merchants,	5
Lawyers and Physicians,	6
Retail Traders	4
Clerks,	6
Teachers,	5
Mechanics,	10
Sewing women,	7
Laborers,	12
	61

This is giving the Gospel something like *fair play*. And hen, with a congregation composed of such materials, the roportion of offerings rises to so high a figure, what would it ot do in the great pewed parishes of our large cities, where ew-rents and fashion, silks and satins, feathers and flounces, ave little or no room for the poor?

We know well that it may be urged in reply to these imperct statistics, that they are to be accounted for, perhaps, by loal peculiarities, or by the character and zeal of individual lergymen. We will therefore take more particularly the orking of the two systems in two different places, in each of hich the *same clergyman* at different times tried both plans, nd with results highly characteristic of each.

Let us begin with St. Paul's, Key West, Florida, under the Rectorship of the Rev. C. C. Adams. There the old Church blown down) was rented. The new Church, built in 1848, was *ree*, and the difference soon began to be felt. The Communiants increased from 15 in 1848 to 98 in 1856; the monthly oferings from $3 or $4 to $20 or $30. The Church was *always ut of debt* on the Free plan. The Rector's income of $900 a ear was during all that time paid quarterly with *perfect puno uality*, never once failing to be ready when called for. The oor were attracted, and an impulse was given to the Church, *ver all the sects in the place.*

The other case is that of Christ Church, Vicksburg, under he Rev. F. W. Boyd, the late lamented Patterson, and the Rev. Mr. Lord. The latter part of the pew system, and the beginning of the free, were both during Mr. Patterson's Rectorship.

The Parish was organized in 1839; Church not built an consecrated till May 3, 1843. Two days after consecration, th pews were sold. The Rev. F. W. Boyd was Rector, for tw yrs, at a salary of $1,200 a year. He then resigned, his salar being in arrear $1,050, and $1,225 being due from pew holders The Rev. S. Patterson was called in September, 1845, at salary of $1,000 a year; of which he afterwards voluntarily gav up $200; and yet, even at this reduced rate, in less than thre years it was in arrear to the amount of $436. The remedie proposed were, *increase of the rent* on each pew, and a *further* reduction of the Rector's salary! In May, 1849, the arrears ha increased to $599. In June, after "Resolving" that not mor than $800 a year could be relied on from pew-rents forthe salar they coolly voted that the Rector's salary consist of the pew-rent whatever they may be; the arrears of pew-rent going to liqui date the arrears of salary! There was evidently little comfor in his prospect; and accordingly, by the end of April, 185 the arrears of salary had mounted up to $704.95. At thi point, the pew-system—that indispensable means of "supportin the Church"—was *abandoned in despair*. All the pews, (ex cept three, likewise added soon after,) were thereupon declare Free, and a new era at once began. *The salary has never bee in arrears since*. It started, on the Free system, at $800, an has since steadily risen. The quota assessed for the Bishop' salary is promptly paid in the same way. After Mr. Patterson' death, of yellow fever, in 1853, Mr. Lord was called at $1,400 besides a life policy costing $160 a year; moreover, a par sonage was purchased and put in complete repair, at a cos of some $3,500; all which, with $200 added to the salary in Easter, 1855, makes his income equal to $2,000 a year. Nor is this all. Other contributions for Church objects have in creased in similar manner. During the past year, they have amounted to $2,902.61, besides the Rector's salary. During the reign of the pew-system, the grounds of the Church were uninclosed; hogs, and worse nuisances still, were at home in the basement. The ground is now enclosed, and planted tastefully with trees and flowers, in the midst of which rises the monument of the lamented Patterson, standing under the shadow of those trees which his own hand had planted. The ordinary attendance at Church has nearly doubled, the gain being from the middle and lower classes, and the *young men*, who had been kept away mainly by the bugbear of *pews*. The number of communicants has increased to 120, of whom 117 have been known to commune on one day. An organ, to cost [redacted] has been ordered and is subscribed for; and further ac[redacted]tion for colored people is provided in the gallery. Ev-

Church call is answered promptly, cheerfully, easily, and he full amount, and sometimes more.

hese are specimens of the mode in which the Church is pported" by Pew-rents, and "*must certainly go down*" un- the system of Free seats. Our advice to doubters may all ummed up in two words—*Try it.*

ut this whole question of "support"—though satisfactorily osed of even by what we have said—must rightfully be ed on far higher ground. "The Church *must be supported,*" s one. "How can the Clergy labor and preach the Gospel, hey be not *supported?*" asks another. "The first requisite uccess," chimes in a third, "is a *competent support* for the inister." In England, they will not even consecrate a new urch, until there is some endowment secured, for the perma- nt *support* of the Parson. The odious prominence thus given he matter of "*support,*" is a very characteristic commen- y upon the profound scheme of successful finance, which the urch of our day so generally adopts, namely: The selling birthright of a *Free Gospel*, for that wretched mess of pot- e known as the Pew-system. She devours the proceeds, h as little satisfaction as Pharaoh's lean kine experienced wallowing their fatter fellows; and finds, at length, that one ss of pottage—and such thin pottage too—is not enough to vent forever after the pangs of returning hunger. "Give! ve!" is the cry of the famishing Clergy, from Dan to Beer- ba. The ministers of Christ's Church are almost starving, ause this pew-renting Church does not give her *Reverend* cholars and Gentlemen" as much to live on as men of the rld give to draymen, and third-rate clerks, and French cooks. s state of things is disgraceful. The half-suppressed cry of ched-up clerical poverty is too sadly reluctant to be feigned; oo real to be longer disregarded. And yet that such a cry uld be raised in the midst of, and everywhere throughout, hurch so abounding in wealth as ours, is a burning shame. re must be "something rotten in Denmark." What *is* it? o can tell us? Let us examine it for a while, patiently and estly, and we shall find out.

'How shall they hear without a preacher?" saith St. Paul. d that is what we all say. There is a great deficiency in isterial supply. What remedy is proposed? Every where hear but one: "Pray ye to the Lord of the harvest." ry good advice, none better. Men therefore pray, or appear be praying, very earnestly: but they do *nothing more,*— l there is an end. The deficiency is *not remedied.*

We have not yet reached the cure, then. Let us go on to

[illegible] Of course a m
be ordained before he ought to preach: but will his
tion find him in bread and butter? Will it pay ho
and coal bills? Will it support him, and his wife and
"How shall they preach *except they be supported*?"
the way we talk in this nineteenth century! Yet St. P
nothing there about being *supported*. Curious that he
seem to take it for granted that they would be supporte
not? We never take it for granted! We know bett
Paul must have lived in a very enthusiastic age! It
age of miracles then!"—and so we shrug our shoulders,
it pass: when if we would but push the matter a little
we might chance to light on a grand discovery.

St. Paul evidently could not have forgotten the duty
upon Christians to "*support*" their Clergy, as we call it
body that has ever heard the Offertory read, knows th
sparing words of St. Paul to the rich and luxurious Cori
"*If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a gr*
ter if we shall reap your worldly things?" And again
same. "*Do ye not know, that they who minister abo*
things live of the sacrifice; and they who wait at the a
partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord also or
that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.
again, to the "foolish Galatians," he says, with a short
and searching severity, which ought to stir the hearts a
sciences of both preachers and hearers to the depth
time they say or hear it.—"*Let him that is taught in th*
minister unto him that teacheth in all good things.
DECEIVED, GOD IS NOT MOCKED: FOR WHATSOEVER A MAN
THAT SHALL HE REAP." This is St. Paul's doctrine about s

or stop the ears of that city of merchant princes—those revelers in all that was exquisite in art, wealth and refined sensuality,—it was for this reason, that he chose *that very city* as the place where to labor with his own hands at his humble trade of tent-making, so that he might not be chargeable to any of them, but give them the Gospel FREE, *in every sense.* St. Paul knew that *works*, to be truly *good* works, must be works of *faith.* He knew that faith cometh *by hearing*, and not *before they can begin to hear.* He does not therefore tell them to support their preacher, *in order* that he *may* preach unto them. And the preacher is not to wait for a support, *before he shall begin* to preach. But he *must* preach *because he is sent*, not because he is "supported." And he *must* be *supported*, not in order that he may preach, but *because he does preach.* It is not a bargain on either side: but a *duty* on *both sides.* Preaching comes *first.* Faith follows as the blessing upon hearing the Word. And then the good work of supporting the ministry comes last of all, as one of the fruits of faith. To put this good work as one that can by any possibility be rightly done *before Faith*, is to reverse the Gospel, and turn it *completely inside out.*

Therefore, in all St. Paul's strong commands on this subject, he never leaves us in any doubt as to which comes first. A man "planteth a vineyard" *first*, before he "eateth of the fruit thereof." He "feedeth the flock" *first*, before he "eateth of the milk of the flock." The Apostle says, truly, "we *have sown* unto you spiritual things," *before* he asks, "is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly things?" Men *first* "minister about holy things," *before* they have any right to "live of the sacrifice;" they *first* "wait at the altar," before they are "partakers with the altar." So "preach the Gospel" comes *first*, "live of the Gospel" comes *afterwards.* Men must *first* be "taught in the Word," *before* they are bound to "minister unto him that teacheth in all good things." And then comes the stern, clear-ringing warning against precisely what the pew-system has done—the Apostle straitly charges us, "Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap." He must sow *first*, and reap *afterwards.* To reverse this heavenly order, as the pew-system does throughout, is to *deceive ourselves*, and to *mock God.* We deceive ourselves when we trust to that pew-system which paralyzes us, as the main reliance for the "support" of the Church. And we mock God, when his Church, though rolling in wealth, leaves his priests to starve.

But priests may learn, as well as people, from these sharp, soul-cleaving words, "*Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he*

reap." The Clergy have sown cowardice, and reap starvation. So long as they speak with weak lips and with a stammering tongue upon the *duty of giving*, and giving with that abundance which is required by the *law of love:* so long will their poverty pinch their cheeks, and leanness scarce cover their bones. So long as they "fear to offend the laity" by preaching what they ought, so long the laity will *not* fear to offend both God and them, by doing what they ought *not.* If the clergy, therefore, reap emptiness, let them look to it, whether they have not sowed *chaff*, instead of wheat.

The Church, with instinctive fidelity, follows closely after Holy Scripture. She does not pretend to any ability to improve upon St. Paul. Preaching first, practising afterwards. The true old-fashioned mode of pewed churches, is to make the collection *before the sermon*, lest something in the sermon might perchance move the conscience to be more liberal than "Mr. Worldly-Wisdom" has determined on beforehand. The Church, however, orders the offertory *after* the sermon, not before; and *immediately* after, in order that the preaching of the Word may be *immediately* embodied in works of faith. She does not believe that there is any virtue worth relying on in works done "*before* the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit." She says of them,—in words so admirably descriptive of the beauties of the pew-system, that we cannot resist the temptation to quote them in full—she says (Article XIII) that they—

> "Are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, ... yea, rather, for that they are *not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done*, we *doubt not* but they *have the nature of sin.*"

Thus, then, the two systems stand compared. On the one side, the first thing sought is the *preaching* of the Gospel; on the other, the first and foremost object is the *pay.* On the one plan, the duty of supporting the Church follows as a *consequence* of preaching: on the other, the preaching follows as an enjoyment *consequent* upon supporting the Church; in strict accordance with that popular axiom which embodies the whole philosophy of the pew-system in its proper relative order: "*No pay, no preaching.*" On the one hand, the *motive* for paying to "support the Church," is love to God and love to man: on the other, the only motives are selfish—selfish for one's own exclusive comfort, or for that of family, or for the respectability of social position. On the one hand, the *standard* of the

nount to be given, is God's own standard,—*the ability of each an*, according as God hath given him: on the other, the stand- d is the voice of *the world*,—how much other people give for milar pews; or, how much *that* pew will fetch at auction.

In *History*, the one is of Pentecostal birth, and from thence- rward the invariable path to all the real conquests the Church s ever gained in any age, even in this our own land, and in ese our own days. The other is of Puritanic birth, stealing rreptitiously and illegally into the Church, and thencefor- ard invariably blighting her growth, stifling the breath of r freedom, stiffening the pliant energy of her members, arving her Clergy, and so choking up the River of Life—of hich she is the appointed channel—that its irrepressible aters are forced over their lawful banks, and run to waste in range pastures, whose irregular fertility shames the barren- ss of the very "Garden of the Lord." Even in the mildest rm of the evil, we find that all its real ornaments are jewels olen from the very system it would fain destroy; while, the moment of its loudest boasts about its success in "sup- rting" the clergy, there is a more universal and more unde- iable outcry against the "starvation-point" of that "support," n ever any part of the Christian Church has been compelled raise before.

In *Argument*, we have seen that the advantages of a "certain ome," and "keeping families together," and "getting some- ng for one's money," are no sufficient justifications of the w-system. Even granting that the assertion as to income re true, will they ask us to weigh the *souls of men* who are v *kept out*, against a few more *dollars* to be *gotten in?* And ll men's souls be made to kick the beam, as of less weight he scales of the Church, than Mammon? That some re- ctable families may say their prayers more comfortably, is sufficient reason for excluding hundreds and thousands of er families from any chance to worship at all. Nor is it r comfort to think that a few well-to-do men "get the worth heir money;" when thereby the masses of the poor outside, kept from getting even so much as a *hearing* of that Gos- which may open to them the gates of Paradise.

In *Essential Principle*, we have found that the one system fol- s the order of St. Paul: the other reverses it. The one puts ith before Works: the other, Works before Faith. The one olishes the Gospel in the order in which Christ and His Apos- delivered it: the other turns it wrong side out. "*Free ace*" is the motto over the doors of the one: "*Grace sold*

here," over the doors of the other. The one, with the Spirit and the Bride, says, *Come:* the other with the Flesh and the Devil, says "*Stay away!*" The quickening principle with one is the love of God: with the other, the love of *money*. The instinct of the one is life and growth: of the other, stagnation and death. The one plants the mustard seed of Faith, and waters and trains it up to a goodly tree with great boughs, and leaves and fruit: the other takes the well-grown tree, turns it upside down, buries its leafy boughs deep in the earth, leaves its naked roots to harden in the dry air; and then wonders why it does not grow!

In *Practical Results*, we find that the one *preaches the Gospel to the poor*, as fully as can be desired: while the other has clothed us, in popular estimation, with the wretched reproach that we are "*the Church of the rich*,"—a reproach which is, in God's sight, as loathsome a covering as the shining white scab of the leprosy. And it appears, also, that even in income, the free system is the better of the two: and that, as in other cases of compact with the Devil, men's *souls* are *sure* to be *lost;* while the Arch-fiend, at the same moment, cheats his dupes out of the very price which tempted them to ruin. The Devil's gold-pieces turn to slate-stones: the clergy who cling to the Pew system for a "support," cry aloud from hunger. And no wonder! How should it be otherwise, when in the very House of God, Mammon sits aloft upon the throne of *Love*; *Exclusion* is the law of the Temple built for *Communion*; and the sound of the voices of St. Paul and St. James,—nay of the Lord Christ Himself,—is drowned by the soulless, galloping gabble of the auctioneer. There is but one more step to be taken in this direction. Tear down the glorious standard, bearing the monogram of Christ and His cross, which of old gave the Victory to the Roman world: a follower of the Lamb, and all his crew of evil Christendom to-day. Tear it down, we say. Run up, instead, the [illegible] flag. And inscribe upon it, in golden letters, the truthful and watchword of Christian worship. "Worship [illegible]!"

The two systems [illegible] opposed to one another, somewhat, and [illegible] of practice, indeed, but the one, in essence, a worship of [illegible] the other, of Mammon. Like Christ and Belial, the two stand in the Blessing and the Curse, as those two gods [illegible] stood by men to choose, in deadly earnest, [illegible] the one as the other. In the broad and generous shadow of the one, [illegible] of the richest person [illegible] the voice of Mammon which [illegible] upon the [illegible] in the hard and peeled scalp of the other. Night and barrenness are spread out like the

dreary drought and desolations of Gilboa, where the Lord departed even from His own Anointed, and left him whose love passed the love of women, to fall beneath the sword of the uncircumcised.

It is high time, moreover, for the Church of America to take her choice between them. "How long halt ye between two opinions?"—might as startlingly be asked of us now, as of ancient Israel on the slopes of Carmel. All round us are multiplying rapidly the signs, that it is to the "little Flock" the Lord God is making ready to give the Kingdom. All round us the old and numerous foes of the Church are preparing to make themselves an easy prey, when the Day of the Lord shall come. Rome has at length repudiated her lying claim to antiquity, thrown off the mask of impudent deceit, and *now* dates her creed, not from Christ, and St. Peter and St. Paul, but from the decree of Pope Pius IX, on the 8th of December, 1854. In this land, Romanists are largely deprived of their aggressive power, being compelled to dilute their Popery so extensively with Protestantism, that its best friends *in Italy* would hardly know it. They are weakened, also, by the political suspicion under which they labor, being the only body of Christians which invariably mixes itself up with politics: while our rapidly growing *prestige* among the wiser men of all parties, is solely due to the fact that we confine ourselves wholly to religion, and *let politics alone*. Therefore it is that the threefold cord of the Church is, even now, the strongest band that binds this Union together. And finally, the innumerable desertions from the ranks of Romish immigrants are a fearful foretaste to them of the falling away in their numbers, by the time another generation shall have still further transformed their ignorant masses by the education and the atmosphere of freedom. And the tens of thousands thus falling away—who shall gather them in?

On the other hand, there is not a sect in the land, no matter how bitter, in time past, against the Church, which does not now feel more and more of her influence, and is not now secretly—nay openly—yearning after those very things which have been so long hated and despised. "Sectarianism" and the "Sectarian spirit" are a stench in the nostrils of all the sects, without exception. Their own people loathe that meat which is all that their pastors have to break to them as the Bread of Life. The usages which of old they most abhorred, they now resume, with more eagerness of enjoyment, indeed, than is often found among us. Sick of extemporary prayers, they are groping and feeling their way towards a Liturgy.

They sing once more the Psalter to antiphonal chaun
stretch forth and grasp each other's hands, striving
among themselves that Unity which they have not
the want of which they know their souls to be faint a
On every side the disintegration of old organized e
going on. It seems almost as if the Church had been
was done of old at Jericho;—as if the priests of the
already compassed the city seven times, and that at
ing of their silver trumpets the buttresses of thick
had crumbled away, and the massive walls of separ
fallen down flat, so that all now needed from the Isra
was only to ascend up every man straight before him,
the city. The whole is gradually yet rapidly openi
easy conquest. And therefore no longer defense, or
but *conquest* should henceforth be the chief instinct o
Let her grow, and gain, and ride on, conquering, an
quer.

But to do this she must first herself be fully FREE.
of them that bring good tidings of good, how shal
beautiful upon the mountains, how shall they go on, p
salvation, so long as they are thus heavily laden wit
ters of a system that makes the Church a prisoner at
her own house? The hands that are stretched forth to
to bestow unto others that blessed liberty with whi
hath made us free;—how shall they win the wicked w
ceive the gift, so long as every motion rattles the man
yet encumber her arms;—manacles of heaviest lead,
ing those hands down to earth, when they should be
to heaven;—manacles of lead, yet thinly and shabbily
the outside, to cheat fools into the belief that they
ments of gold, instead of the shackles of slavery? I
the priests' trumpets be heard throughout all Jerich
take so great pains to muffle up their soul-piercing sc
it shall never be heard outside the canvas walls of
tents of Israel? No. Bring the trumpets out into th
that their notes may be borne on the wings of all the
heaven, and unto all everywhere that have ears to h
the heart of the Church expand and grow great with he
work, so that her swelling bosom shall snap asunder
cords with which she is bound. Let her burst the fe
her feet, and break in pieces the gilded, mocking
from off her hands: and then may she be once more s
tiful upon the mountains, publishing peace. Then, a
then, may she spread forth her loving arms, in triumj
brace a New World.

All the people are gathered together, weary of the cruel vanities of Baal. The day is far spent. The time of the offering of the Evening Sacrifice draweth nigh. The Altar of the LORD, that was broken down, is repaired. The sacrifice lies upon the Apostolic number of unmoving stones, ready for the sacred flame. Again, and again, and again, have our prophets drenched it through and through with cold water. Would God that Elijah were only here to call down *the Fire!* And is he not promised unto us once more "before the coming of the great and dreadful Day of the Lord?" And is not that Day now nigh at hand? Aye! *Once more* shall there fall Fire from Heaven! And *once more* shall ALL THE PEOPLE fall upon their faces, and say, "The Lord, He is the GOD; the LORD, He is the GOD!"

Art. VII.—BOOK NOTICES.

The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History. By John Lothrop Motley. In three volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 579, 582, 664. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

We have examined these volumes of Mr. Motley with surprise and pleasure. Surprise, that an author hitherto unknown to fame should at once come forward to occupy a place in the very front ranks of our men of genius and learning—pleasure, in this new illustration of the intellectual treasures which are contributing to enrich our national literature. We know full well the popular impression in England as to the influence of our social institutions on high mental culture; and yet, notwithstanding the deluge of mere trash poured perpetually from our press in every department of literature, there is no inconsiderable number of men in our country who have both genius and learning to give to the proudest annals of our nation, and to her triumphs in the material world, befitting expression; in a word, to win for our nation as high a reputation in the nobler fields of Science and the fine Arts as she has gained in those of industrial prosperity. In this select list we may place Mr. Motley, the author of these three portly volumes. He has chosen a field comparatively new, and yet a theme fully worthy of his talents. We are in danger of forgetting the lofty position which the Dutch, as a nation, once occupied; for in the *renaissance* which characterized the sixteenth century, in the sundering of the chains of feudalism, in the emancipation from papal bondage of the national intellect and heart, in the sudden expansion and growth of national enterprise, in the extent and value of her colonial possessions, and the magnitude of her commercial relations, the Dutch Republic stood at that day unrivaled among all the nations of the earth. In all Eastern and Southern Asia, South Africa, and Australia, what are the British doing now, but reaping where the Dutch have sowed? and over all our own continent, in South America, the West Indies, and the United States, we find still the abiding fruits of that same element of national enterprise and power.

We were led to anticipate much from this work, from the high compliment paid to it in advance by our distinguished historian, Mr. Prescott. The author has spent several years in the country whose annals he here narrates, and has faithfully studied everything bearing upon his subject, both the contemporary chroniclers and later historians. The Royal Archives of the Hague, of Brussels, and of Dresden, numerous public libraries, and the manuscripts of the Venetian envoys, &c., &c., have been thrown open to his inspection. He seems to have lacked no facility for learning the secret history of the subtle policy of that crafty Republic, of whose selfish cunning Japan is at this day a striking example.

The period which his history embraces is brief, being from the abdication of Charles V, in 1555, to the death of William the Silent, Prince of Orange, in 1584. After a rapid sketch, geographical, ethnographical, political, and religious, of the Netherlands, from the earliest period, in which the elements of the national life and character and their development, are traced for sixteen centuries, down to the imposing abdication of Charles V, he then brings before us the new drama, when the nation, under the promptings of a new and mighty principle, rose in rebellion against the tyranny of Philip II, and after a long, complicated, and bloody struggle, secured for itself complete emancipation from Spanish bondage. The leading characters upon the stage are well presented. It is in this kind of portrait painting, where the current of history is

he time being personified, a style of writing in which Macaulay so greatly ls, that Mr. Motley makes his best appearance. Philip II, the husband of y Tudor—William of Orange, known as the "Silent,"—Granvelle, the ac-plished, crafty Cardinal—Lamoral, Count of Egmont—Francis, Duke of gon and Anjou, a prince "ferocious without courage, ambitious without t, and bigoted without opinions,"—these are among the cleverest sketches se volumes. Of course much of the ground covered by our author is occu- also by another of our distinguished historians, whose recent work is ined in our previous pages. Yet Mr. Motley's labors are far enough from g superfluous. He has pursued as his one engrossing theme what with Mr. cott was only an incident, though a most important one.

forming our estimate of the national character of the Dutch, we cannot et that it had in it an element of weakness. It was too exclusively sordid mercenary, and so became selfish and almost unscrupulous. It was no e destiny that paled the star of Holland: but the fearful avengings of that a law which, however unrecognized, still rules among the nations. France acquired temporary mastery over Holland herself; and in the East her *tige* has been steadily yielding before the power of England. Still the ch government retains many of her most valuable India possessions, though, , unlike the English, it is only to brutalize heathenism instead of Chris-izing it. The greater part of the revenue of the Dutch government, in neo, for example, is derived from the traffic in opium. It is in respect to higher province of the Christian philosopher, that the history before us s distinctness and boldness. Indeed, the author's power as a writer is in id and vigorous narrative, in felicitous grouping of his heroes, rather than ofty generalization. A leading idea which pervades the work, to wit, that conception of liberty in the heart of a people, is in itself an element of ional power—contains, when broadly stated, a dangerous fallacy. It is an element of power only when conditioned and guided by a national science, a conscience vitalized and directed by God's revealed will. We ak, also, that the author's *beau ideal* of national greatness and glory lacks much the higher moral elements, and rests too exclusively in the intellec-l and the material. Mr. Motley is a sturdy republican and a hearty Protest-. His style is lively and picturesque—more ornamental and yet less chaste, pure, and free from foreign idioms than that of Mr. Prescott. But the work n honor, and an important accession, to our national literature. A General ex adds to its value as a work of reference. The work will repay more ntion than we are able here to give it, and we hope to return to it again, to examine more particularly the accuracy of one or two points in the his-cal narrative.

COLLECTIONS OF THE TABLE-TALK OF SAMUEL ROGERS, to which is added Personana. Edited by the Rev. ALEX. DYCE. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 856. 12mo. pp. 342. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

amuel Rogers, the poet, died Dec. 18th, 1855, at his house in St. James' ce, London, in the presence of Dr. Beattie and Mr. E. Paine, his attendant. Rogers was born about the year 1760, and had therefore attained the ven-ble age of ninety-five. In 1787, after completing a course of travel, he pub-ed his "Ode to Superstition," and other poems; and five years later eared his "Pleasures of Memory," by which his fame as a poet was estab-ed. In 1798 he published his "Epistle to a Friend," and other poems; in 4, his "Vision of Columbus and Jacqueline;" in 1819, "Human Life; in 2, the first part of his "Italy," on the illustration and printing of which he aid to have spent £10,000. Mr. Rogers' house, in St. James' place, was a fect treasury of art. The pictures are amongst the very best of their s, and though few in number, are said to have cost £6,000.

When Rogers made his appearance as a poet, Lord Byron was unborn—and Byron has been dead thirty-one years! When Percy Bysshe Shelly was born, Rogers was in his thirtieth year—and Shelly has been dead nearly thirty-four years! When Keats was born, "The Pleasures of Memory" was looked upon as a standard poem—and Keats has been dead thirty-five years! When this century commenced, the man who died but yesterday, and in the latter half too of the century, had already numbered as many years as Burns and Byron had numbered when they died.

Mr. Rogers was born before the following English poets: Scott, Southey, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Moore, Campbell, Bloomfield, Cunningham, Hogg, James Montgomery, Shelley, Keats, Wilson, Tom Hood, Kirk White, Lamb, Joanna Baillie, Felicia Hemans, L. E. L., and he outlived them all. The oldest living poets are, Walter Savage Landor, born 1755; Leigh Hunt, born 1784; and Barry Cornwall, born 1790.

Mr. Rogers was famous for his conversational powers, for his short smart stories, and his sarcastic criticisms; and the Rev. Alexander Dyce has given us the above volume of such gatherings from the breakfast-cloth and dinner-table at St. James' place. Mr. Dyce was a never-failing guest at the Tuesday breakfasts, and had to endure, in common with others, incessant repetitions of the same stories from his host. He does not, however, tell the same story twice in print; and his wallet of queer and pithy stories is well stored.

As a poet, Rogers wrote very little. It was a favorite saying of Sydney Smith: "When Rogers produces a couplet he goes to bed, and the knocker is tied, and straw is laid down, and the candle is made, and the answer to inquiries is, that Mr. Rogers is as well as can be expected."

One of the severest things Lord Byron ever wrote was a satire on Rogers. It begins thus:

Nose and chin would shame a knocker,
Wrinkles that would puzzle Cocker;
Mouth which marks the envious scorner,
With a scorpion in each corner,
Turning its quick tail to sting you
In the place that most may wring you;
Eyes of lead-like hue, and gummy;
Carcass pick'd out from some mummy;
Bowels (but they were forgotten,
Save the liver, and that's rotten;)
Skin all sallow, flesh all sodden—
Form the Devil would frighten God in.
Is 't a corpse stuck up for show,
Galvanized at times to go?
With the Scripture in connection,
New proof of the resurrection?
Vampyre, ghost, or ghoul, what is it?
I would walk ten miles to miss it.

His remains were interred in the once rural churchyard of Hornsey, not far from Stoke Newington, the place of his birth. Some lines which he loved, "worth all the fine writing (he was wont to say) that the world ever produced," will not unfitly conclude this notice:

A GRAVE BENEATH A TREE.

When my soul flies to the first great Giver,
Friends of the Bard, let my dwelling be
By the green bank of that rippling river,
Under the shade of yon tall beach-tree.
Bury me there, ye lovers of song,

When the prayers for the dead are spoken,
With my hands on my breast,
Like a child at rest,
And my lyre in the grave unbroken.

We commend this Boswellian book as amusing in its reminiscences of many f the celebrities of the day.

PPLETON'S CYCLOPÆDIA OF BIOGRAPHY; embracing a Series of Original Memoirs of the most Distinguished Persons of all times. Written for this work by Sir Archibald Alison, D. C. L.; William Baird, M. D., F. L. S.; Sir David Brewster, F. R. S.; James Bryce, A. M., F. G. S.; John Hill Burton; Professor Creasy, A. M.; Professor Eadie, D. D., LL. D.; Professor Ferguson, A. M.; Professor Gordon, F. R. S. E.; James Hedderwick; John A. Heraud; Robert Jamieson, D. D.; Charles Knight; James Manson; James McConnechy; Professor Nichol, LL. D.; Elihu Rich; Professor Spalding, M. A.; Professor Thomson, M. D., F. R. S.; Ralph N. Wornum. American edition edited by FRANCIS L. HAWKS, D. D., LL. D. With numerous illustrations. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 8vo. pp. 1,058. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The basis of this work is the London edition of the "Cyclopædia of Biogra- y," issued during the last year. The peculiarity of the English edition is, at the preparation of notices of different classes of distinguished men was trusted to persons eminent in corresponding departments of learning. Thus istory, Politics, Law, Military Science, Ecclesiastical Affairs, and the Mystics, ere given to Alison, Burton, Creasy, Eadie, Ferguson, and the Editor; Clas- ical authors are treated by Ferguson; Theological and Religious, by Eadie nd Jamieson; Poets, Novelists, &c., by Spalding: Mathematical and Physical cience are entrusted to Sir David Brewster and Nichol; in the Experimental ciences, Chemistry to Thomson; Natural History to Baird; and Applied cience to Gordon; Medical Science to McConnechy; Geography to Bryce; ental Philosophy to Nichol; Theology, Church History, the Fathers, Re- rmers, and Schoolmen, to Eadie; the Fine Arts to Wornum; and the Drama Heraud. So far as the English portion of this work is concerned, it has en done thoroughly, and is the most complete Biographical Dictionary for opular use extant. We cannot speak as unqualifiedly of the American por- on of the work. Though edited by the Rev. Dr. Hawks, yet no clue is given the names of the writers of the American articles. Nor are we surprised at is; for they are often, (not always,) hastily written, and extremely imper- ct and unsatisfactory. Thus one of the finest American scholars our country s ever produced, was the late Prof. Kingsley. Here is all we are told of him: Kingsley, James L., an American scholar and classical professor at Yale Col- ge, 1778–1852." But where was he born? Where was he educated? In hat department of classical learning did he excel? What did he publish? also to the late Rev. Dr. Jarvis, four meagre lines are given; while on the me page John Jay occupies a column and a half. Other similar illustrations e abundant. We know that the Americans are a "fast" people, and that e fault of which we complain belongs to almost every thing which they un- rtake to do. In Art, Science, Religion, Philosophy, every thing tends to hat is superficial and showy. Perhaps, considering the wealth of learning hich has been expended upon this work, even this exception may seem cap- ous and hypercritical. Certainly the Editor and Publishers have given to the blic a most invaluable work, and the thousands of names which they have ded to the English edition add immensely to its worth. With half a dozen Biographical Dictionaries" within our reach, great and small, this is more rviceable than the whole of them, and for almost all practical purposes is the ly one to which any person need refer.

THE CATHOLIC. Letters addressed by a Jurist to a young kinsman, proposing to join the Church of Rome. By E. H. DERBY. Boston: Jewett & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 298.

This is what the English call a really clever book. The author addressed these Letters to a young kinsman who, misled by Milner and other kindred writers, had suddenly conceived the idea that the Church of Rome is the only Primitive, Apostolic and Catholic Church, and was about to be baptized into that communion. The author, Mr. Derby, at once addressed him a series of Letters, drawing his proofs from Holy Scripture, the Early Saints, Fathers, and Popes, as Augustine, Clement, Irenæus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Jerome, Athanasius, Leo, &c.; showing beyond a doubt that that Church is not, and that our own Church *is*, Apostolic, Primitive and Catholic. It being his express aim to destroy the *prestige* of Rome by exposing the hollowness of her pretensions, the author was of course obliged to take the position of an assailant, and hence he is intensely and vigorously protestant; as these old Fathers and writers whom he quotes are, when brought to bear upon the position of modern Rome. As might have been expected, with such an argument presented to an honest and ingenuous mind, the Letters accomplished the end designed by their author, and they are now published at the solicitation of friends. The argument is sufficiently learned, is clear and logical, the language dispassionate and free from invective, and the whole effort is an honor to the head and heart of the writer. He has examined the argument, however, in reference to Order and Discipline, rather than Doctrine, and in this respect his argument is defective. He also speaks of Chevalier Bunsen as an author "of the highest confidence," when he ought to have known that Bunsen has lost *caste* with the orthodox for his gross heresies. He also shows a want of discernment in using the stale and meaningless phrase, "the Protestant Faith," which is at best the merest nonentity. Still, notwithstanding these and some other marks of a much better lawyer than theologian, his book is a serviceable one. The Appendix contains some valuable papers on the Discipline of the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria, and an admirable digest of evidence respecting the founding of the early British Church by St. Paul. We must give up all faith in man and in truth, or the time will come when such works as this will be felt among the more intelligent and honest of the Romanists themselves.

And yet, highly as we estimate the value of such works, they will not have the slightest influence in deterring a certain class of men from going over to Rome. Moral argument has nothing to do with the question of their apostasy. We do them too much credit when we suppose so.

MEN AND TIMES OF THE REVOLUTION; OR, Memoirs of Elkanah Watson: Including Journals of Travels in Europe and America, from 1777 to 1842, with his Correspondence with Public Men, and Reminiscences and Incidents of the Revolution. Edited by his son, WINSLOW C. WATSON. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 8vo. pp. 460. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

Elkanah Watson was born in Plymouth, Mass., in 1758, and, having early in life devoted himself to mercantile pursuits, traveled extensively over the country, and became intimately acquainted with the leading public men. In 1779, at the age of twenty one years, he embarked for France, and went into business there, where he enjoyed the friendship of some of the "men of the Revolution," Franklin, John Adams, and others. The author in his Preface says:

"My father, from the age of nineteen to near the close of his life, which was protracted to more than four score years, was in the habit of recording his observations of men and incidents, as the events occurred to which they relate.

"This period embraced the epoch of the War of Independence, and of those amazing mutations which have marked the transformation of dependent colo-

nies into a mighty nation; and of a rude and sequestered wilderness into a territory teeming with beauty, cultivation and affluence.

"In Europe and America he was in the midst of the scenes of this pregnant era, an intimate associate with many of the individuals who impelled or guided these changes, and a vigilant observer of the occurrences connected with their development.

"The journals of my father form a large body of manuscript, which, in connection with a multiplicity of publications on various and most diversified subjects, and a highly extensive correspondence with some of the most eminent men of our annals, comprehend many volumes. These materials constitute the elements of the work I now respectfully submit to the public."

One of the best things in the work is the account of the speech of King George III. in Parliament, recognizing "American Independence." Such works as this have great importance now; they will promote loyalty, rebuke faction, and so cement our national Union. In personal anecdote, historical incident, and geographical information, the book is attractive and valuable.

THE LIVES OF THE BRITISH HISTORIANS. By EUGENE LAWRENCE. 2 vols., 12mo. New York: C. Scribner. 1856. pp. 395, 380.

The extent of this work will be seen in the names of the historians whose "lives" the author has here written; as—the Early Historians Gildas, Bede, &c.,—Sir Walter Raleigh—William Camden—Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon—Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury,—Thomas Fuller—Laurence Echard—Robert Brady—John Oldmixon—Thomas Carter—William Robertson—George, Lord Lyttleton—Tobias Smollet—David Hume—Macpherson—Ferguson—Gibbon—Orme—Goldsmith—Fox, &c. More than one half of the first volume is devoted to Sir Walter Raleigh and Bishop Burnet; and more than half of the second to David Hume. This last sketch is to us the best part of the whole work, as it gives a brief yet graphic view of the private life of that distinguished man, analyzing his character, without, however, as thoroughly as we could wish, dissecting his religious principles. The author's praise of Burnet as a historian, is too unqualified and is extravagant; nor has he done full justice to those loyal, much-abused men, who, in those stormy times, saved the Church alike from the machinations of the Puritans and the Papists. The volumes are pleasingly written in a neat and vigorous style, and cover a field which we believe has not before been occupied.

THE SKEPTICAL ERA IN MODERN HISTORY; or the Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century, the Product of Spiritual Despotism. By T. M. POST. New York: C. Scribner. 1856. 12mo. pp. 264.

Mr. Post discusses, incidentally, three of the great questions of the day; first, the causes of Modern Infidelity; second, the primary causes of the Reformation; and third, the relation of Faith and Reason, or of Dogmatic Theology with the human understanding. We do not mean that he makes such a formal division of his subject, but most of what he says will come under one or another of these three heads. It is noticeable how these questions are agitating both the extreme wings of Papists and Ultra-Protestants. Balmes, the Abbe Poisson, M. Capefigue, Montalembert, with Romanists in our own country, are trying to account philosophically for these great movements in modern society, throwing discredit upon the real causes of the Reformation, and undervaluing its results. The elegant Chateaubriand declared that it is "*able to point, amid the ruins it has wrought, simply to some fields it has planted, and some manufactures it has established.*" The same thoughts, in much coarser style, we find echoed by the new Romish recruits in this country. The author before us, on the other hand, takes the opposite view. He finds the causes of modern Infidelity in "the low and relaxed moral tone of the world's mind, at the time the epidemic of unbelief set in—the century and a half of religious agonism and

arms which preceded the revolution in philosophy inaugurated by Ba
Des Cartes in physics and metaphysics, and by Luther in the realm of
—and the rise of the idea of wealth to the ascendency in cabinets of
ments, and in general society. Our view is then directed to the "*Fon
malorum*," the great CAUSE OF CAUSES of the evil we investigate, viz: de
despotism both secular and spiritual, but with especial and portentou
inence of the latter. Our investigation thus brings us to the geograp
and centre of the plague—France. Its position in European civiliza
civil and ecclesiastical constitution and history—its court, monarchy
and literature—these are seen through the malign influence of
espotism, directed to the subnersion of belief; and finally resulting i
ganization of a conspiracy and crusade against the faith of the world."

There is no doubt that these were among the causes of the Infidelit
Eighteenth Century; and Mr. Post describes them, though in a some
clamatory style, yet with clearness and force. The heart of society
from a system of such intolerable despotism, cruelty, and moral co
Nor ought we to wonder at the indignant rage of such men as Volt
Rousseau, and the French Encyclopædists in holding them up to the
scorn of the world.

But these were not *all* the causes of the Infidelity of the Eighteenth
nor are they amongst the principal causes of the Infidelity of the pre
And here is where Mr. Post shows his inappetency to grapple with the
before him. That ultra Protestantism which denies to the Church all a
as the Witness and keeper of the Faith, and which subjects all the My
Revelation to the test of human reason, has no antidote for modern i
It sees no middle ground between the *Aristotelian* and the *Baconian* m
seeking for truth in Christianity; or between groundless authority
freest induction. This is a vital distinction in the controversy: as
is one which Mr. Post in his present position cannot grasp. The gr
tion between us as Churchmen with Romanists on the one side and Ra
on the other turns upon this one simple point. While, therefore, we
of much which the author says, and appreciate the eloquence and fer
which he writes, we cannot but regret that we cannot "see eye to ey
those deeper truths and principles on which all such problems ultimat
depend for their solution. Perhaps we ought to add that there is occ
a tone in his discussion which hardly befits the dignity of his subj
which always betokens the restlessness of conscious weakness. Th
question of the connection of Christianity with civilization and with
progress deserves to be treated with special reference to the present c
of the Universal Church and of Society. But it needs no ordinary pe
such a subject justice.

THE SPANISH CONQUEST IN AMERICA, and its relation to the History of
and to the Government of Colonies. By ARTHUR HELPS. In two
New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 490, 470. New
T. H. Pease.

This work purports to have been written with special reference to
cidation of the establishment of slavery in this country. The author g
to the great Era of modern discovery—traces the rising interest in th
tion—the Portuguese discoveries in Western Africa—the three su
voyages of Columbus,—the results of the discoveries made known, a
influence in the Old World,—the Administration of Columbus and
cessors, Bobadilla and Ovando—the voyages of Ojeda, Nicuesa, Ba
Vasco Nunez—the abortive attempts at Colonization on the part of th
tunate Las Casas,—and the splendid conquests of Hernando Cortez. T
is compendious, is written with much animation of style, and is par
valuable as treating on the forms and modes of social life, which grew
settlement of Spanish America.

SICKNESS—ITS TRIALS AND ITS BLESSINGS. First American from the Fifth London Edition. To which is appended Prayers for the Sick and Dying. New York: Thomas N. Stanford. 12mo. pp. 490.

No one, unless trained in the severe school of sickness, could have written this work; and no person, unless so qualified, is competent to appreciate it. The trials and temptations incident to this state, with its irritability, impatience, petulance, nervousness, pains, weakness, &c., are unknown to those who have not experienced them; and so, too, are the unworldly blessings, the sweet submission, the quiet contentment, and patience, and submission and cheerfulness, and even the thanksgiving, which are the blessed fruits of such a condition when sanctified. The authoress was encouraged to publish by her Pastor, the Rev. F. C. Massingberd, author of the "History of the English Reformation," and the large sale of the work in England is sufficient endorsement of its worth. It is a really choice book, and many a stricken heart will thank God for it. We need not say that the Clergy will find it an invaluable aid in their pastoral duties.

SKETCHES AND ADVENTURES in Madeira, Portugal and the Andalusians of Spain. By the Author of "Daniel Webster and his Cotemporaries." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 445. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

That dreamy, listless, voluptuous atmosphere which bathes and permeates everything in Southern Europe, and especially in Andalusia, seems to have had a good deal of influence upon the author of these sketches; and though he writes cleverly and truthfully for aught we know, there is occasionally a sad want of sound moral tone in his descriptions. His chapters upon Gibraltar, Granada, and the Alhambra are, with the exception just noted, very well done. He might have described all that he saw without ministering to a morbid prurience after what is immodest and indelicate, and in a manner only to be spurned by the pure and virtuous. The deeper problems of Faith, of Civilization, of Morals, and of Society, which Spain now in her decay presents, the present writer does not touch. Why has Spain become such a moral and intellectual chasm?—is a question he does not once raise. The awful fatality which stifled such men as Sanchez, and Louis de Leon, and Miranda, and blighted the heart of the nation, he does not comprehend. In other words he has the pen of a superficial sketcher of life and manners, but not of a philosopher or a thoughtful moralist and Christian.

HARPERS' CLASSICAL LIBRARY.—

THE TRAGEDIES OF ÆSCHYLUS.—Literally translated. With Critical and Illustrative Notes, and an Introduction. By THEODORE ALOIS BUCKLEY, B. A., of Christ Church, Oxford. To which is added an APPENDIX, (not included in Bohn's volume,) containing the new readings of Hermann's Posthumous Edition. Translated and considered by GEORGE BURGES, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 394. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The translation, which is generally after the text of Dindorf, is close and literal, and the numerous notes will greatly aid the student in studying this confessedly difficult author.

LADY'S SECOND JOURNEY ROUND THE WORLD.—From London to the Cape of Good Hope, Borneo, Java, Sumatra, Celebes, Ceram, The Moluccas, etc., California, Panama, Peru, Ecuador, and the United States. By IDA PFEIFFER, Authoress of "The Lady's Journey," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 500. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

This "lady's" first journey round the world, an account of which appeared but four years since, our readers may perhaps recollect. In that book she took occasion to exhibit her aversion to the Missionary work in the East, by

the grossest and most palpable misrepresentations. It seems the locomotive energies of Madame Pfeiffer have again been in vigorous exercise, and on this journey she has exhibited powers of endurance and of fortitude which would be really heroic, if there had been any worthy object to be attained, but which, under the circumstances, appear little less than the most reckless presumption. Why she should face alone the savage cannibals of Sumatra—place herself again and again in the most revolting scenes, where every feeling of delicacy must have been outraged—that is, if she has any delicacy—and all for the mere love of adventure, is to us wholly unaccountable. She thus tells us how she dispersed a formidable company of man-eaters:

"I knew if I could say anything that would amuse them, and perhaps make them laugh, I should have a great advantage over them. . . . I got up, therefore, and patting one of the most violent, who stood next to me, upon the shoulder in a friendly manner, said, with a smiling face, in a jargon half Malay and half Battaker, 'Why, you don't mean to say you would kill and eat a woman, especially such an old one as I am! I must be very hard and tough!' And also I gave them by signs and words to understand that I was not at all afraid of them, and was ready, if they liked, to send back my guide, and go with them alone, if they would only take me as far as the Eier-Tau. Fortunately for me, the doubtless very odd way in which I pronounced their language, and my pantomime, diverted them, and they began to laugh. Perhaps, also, the fearless confidence that I manifested, made a good impression; they offered me their hands, the circle of spearmen opened, and rejoicing not a little at having escaped this danger, I journeyed on, and reached *in* perfect safety a place called Tugala, where the Rajah received me into his house."

As a book of travels the work is of little value; and the author's religious sympathies or rather want of sympathies, are manifest, though not obtrusively.

THE PIONEERS OF THE WEST; or, Life in the Woods. By W. P. STRICKLAND. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1856. 12mo. pp. 403.

This book contains a series of descriptive sketches upon the following subjects: "The West; Pioneer Explorers of the West; Hunters of the West; Pioneer Settlers; Pioneer Preachers; Pioneer Institutions and Professional Men; Pioneer Boatmen: The Prophet Francis; Logan, the Mingo Chief; The Mountain Hunter; Indian Captivity; The 'Old Chief;' or, the Indian Missionary; The Hermit; Panther Hunting; The Squatter Family; The Lost Hunter; Wisconsin Schoolma'am." The book is written with very moderate ability, and is hardly equal to so attractive a title.

PHYSIOLOGY AND CALISTHENICS.—For Schools and Families. By CATHARINE E. BEECHER. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 250. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Miss Beecher's former work on Physiology we did not like for many reasons. We still doubt the propriety of introducing Physiology as a study into our Public Schools; and on this ground, as well as for an evident leaning to quackery, we would not advise that this portion of the present work be introduced into "schools or families." But her system of Calisthenics is admirable, and has already been adopted in several of the schools of New Haven and New York. There is an imperative necessity of more physical training to promote grace, health, strength and beauty in our Seminaries, and especially in our Schools for girls. To secure that object is one design of this little manual. We have first a detailed system of Physiology with drawings and numerous questions appended to each page; together with the author's views on hygiene, in which she strongly advocates the Water Cure. This is the least valuable part of the author's book, and yet many of her rules and suggestions are sensible and valuable. The best portion of her book is her System of Calisthenic Exer-

ctures of the various positions, attitudes, exercises, &c. Vigorous cise and a wholesome nutritious diet would do much to rid us of ickly, sallow faces which our American girls so often present. rever, is one of the natural fruits of American society; and we ism will continue to ape gentility by trying to appear extremely at the sacrifice of the best physical constitution. The best bred s treat this whole subject much more sensibly. They spend much pen air, in riding, walking, gardening, &c., &c., and we need not e noble, beautiful, healthful countenances which even at an ad- d of life so often greet and surprise the American traveler.

F THE CYCLOPÆDIA OF AMERICAN LITERATURE. By E. H. & G. L. . New York: Baker & Godwin. 1856. 8vo. pp. 32.

ng review is from the pen of the Rev. Rufus W. Griswold. We re did not see this pamphlet before admitting to our pages the arti- rclopædia which appeared in our April No. Besides the numerous ccuracies which are proved upon the authors of that work, Mr. arges them with "an utter incapacity to write intelligibly, per- r even grammatically." This is too sweeping; but the work is a hasty production, and unworthy of its title.

.—Moral Influences employed in the Instruction and Government ng. By JACOB ABBOTT. With Engravings. New York: Harper 1856. 12mo. pp. 353. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

ew and revised edition of a thoroughly practical work, by an ex- d successful teacher. The author treats familiarly and illustrates s of the school-room, modes of Instruction, Recitation, Govern- t would be easy enough to show wherein we differ, and most the author on the whole subject of moral and religious influences, on is too well known to make this necessary. The book is sug- as we see is popular.

GRESSIVE READERS, No. 4.—A series of interesting and instructive Prose, Poetry, and Dialogue. With Exercises in Elocution, sup- means for copious practice on Rhetorical Pause, Inflection and Together with an Explanatory Index. By JOHN E. LOVELL, au- ie U. S. Speaker, &c., &c. New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1856. 412.

of "Progressive Readers," by that distinguished teacher, Mr. eady adopted in a large number of the best schools in the country. one of the best teachers of elocution in the country, and these the fruit of his long experience and ripe judgment.

N THE HOUSE. THE BETROTHAL.—Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1856. . 201.

ncited by his wife, "who, more than he, desired his fame," pays Sacred Muse, and chose as his theme,

> "Your gentle self, my wife,
> Yourself, and love that's all in all."
> "The song should have no incidents,
> They are so dull, and pall, twice read;
> Its scope should be the heart's events."

is fragmentary, abounds in episodes, and the incidents finally ter- 'the Betrothal," are plenteously intermixed with sentimental etch- he poet calls "The Accompaniments." 'The mysteries of court-

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

hymns, of course would prevent their use with us for any other than that ivate devotion, and, at first reading, strike us oddly. Doubtless the tune, ich these lyrics were first sung, aided much to introduce them among the le, and, as it were, nationalize them; for we read in the Preface, in relation e Hymn, "Leave God to order all thy ways," written by George Neuk, 1653; "that it spread rapidly among the common people, at first, ut the author's name. A baker's boy, in New Brandenburg, used to sing ir his work, and soon the whole town and neighborhood flocked to him to this beautiful new song." We select as a specimen of these German ns, a part of this one, by Neumarck, arranged for the Thirteenth Sunday Trinity.

"Leave God to order all thy ways,
And hope in Him whate'er betide,
Thou'lt find Him in the evil days,
Thy all-sufficient strength and guide;
Who trusts in God's unchanging love,
Builds on the rock that nought can move.

"What can these anxious cares avail,
These never-ceasing moans and sighs?
What can it help us to bewail
Each painful moment as it flies?
Our cross and trials do but press
The heavier for our bitterness.

"Only thy restless heart keep still,
And wait in cheerful hope; content
To take whate'er His gracious will,
His all discerning love hath sent.
Doubt not our inmost wants are known
To Him who chose us for His own.

"Sing, pray, and swerve not from His ways,
But do thine own part faithfully,
Trust His rich promises of grace,
So shall they be fulfilled in thee;
God never yet forsook at need
The soul that trusted Him indeed."

e Christmas Carol of Luther, 1540, which he himself styles "a Christmas 's song, concerning the child Jesus," written for his little boy Hans, the latter was five years old, is very beautiful, as is also that Hymn of Gerhardt, "Cometh sunshine after rain." But we must refer the reader e book itself for further proof of the beauty of these sacred songs.

e doubtful orthodoxy of Chevalier Bunsen, to whom the book is dedicated, his kind permission," would naturally excite some question in regard to octrinal soundness of these Hymns, especially when he is thus spoken of he Literary Churchman of February 9th: "M. Bunsen has at length ted the Germans and shown himself in his true colors. The Lutherans he Reformers are everywhere exclaiming at his statements, that the doc- of Christ's Divinity is not vital to the Christian scheme, and Justification ith a non-essential point."

s have, however, in our brief perusal of the volume, found nothing at all mpathy with such heretical notions, or with those of any of the school of an Rationalists.

e publisher deserves great credit for the very handsome manner, both as to and type, in which the volume is gotten up, and especially for the elegant ppropriate style of binding.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE WEATHER, AND A GUIDE TO ITS CHANGES. By T. B. BUTLER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 414.

The author of this work is one of the Judges of the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut, and was, in the years 1849–50, a Representative in Congress from the same State. His object in writing, as he states, is not the desire to acquire scientific reputation, but to fulfill a promise given to a friend,—to put on record a series of daily and sometimes hourly observations of the clouds and currents of the atmosphere, connected with reports of the then state of the weather elsewhere—to impress the reader with the belief, "that he will derive a pleasure from a daily familiarity with, and intelligent understanding of the 'countenance of the sky,' not exceeded by that which any other science can afford."

With this in view, and divesting his subject, so far of technical terms, as to make it readily intelligible to all, while enough are retained to give clearness and precision to his statements, he has embodied in the volume an amount of useful information, which commends it at once to the student in the closet, the farmer in his field, the traveler on his journey,—to all who are curious about or interested in the weather.

Starting with the assertion, that from the arrangements which exist for the diffusion of heat and distribution of moisture over the earth, with magnetism as the great agent, result all the phenomena which constitute the weather, he discusses at length the manner in which these elements are produced, diffused and distributed—gives the definition and character of storms—the mode in which, and from what ocean "our rivers return"—analyzes the origin and operation of the winds, and the various theories in relation to them, which he deems fallacious, accompanying his criticisms with his own personal observations, and with such diagrams and explanatory plates, as to place the subject clearly and intelligibly before the reader.

The theory of Meteorologists of the present day, who refer all atmospheric conditions and phenomena to the influence of heat, is thoroughly tested and criticised, and that in no *ex cathedra* tone or manner, but in the spirit of his own language, that "the time has come, or should speedily come, when '*pride of opinion*' and 'esprit du corps,' among theorists and philosophers, should neither be indulged in, nor respected; and when their theories should be freely discussed, and rigidly tested by the observations of practical men."

The last chapter treats upon "Prognostics" of the weather, in which much curious information, with quotations of quaint sayings and proverbs—many of which we hear in every day life—are blended with "signs which foreshow the weather" and those peculiarities exhibited by animals and birds before approaching storms.

No doubt the theories here advanced will meet with many assailants, and in this the author will not be disappointed, but we opine that the great mass of readers, will peruse this volume with equal profit and pleasure.

THE NEW AGE OF GOLD, OR THE LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF ROBERT DEXTER ROMAINE, WRITTEN BY HIMSELF. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 403.

This "New Age of Gold," is a sort of romantic dream, a mere creation of the imagination, though the author labors, (improperly as we think,) to convey the idea that it is a narration of facts, by introducing the names of well known persons, and appending at the end, what purports to be "a note by the publishers," describing the personal appearance of Mr. and Mrs. Romaine. The book is, however, a delightful and pleasant one to read and think over. "It seems written to make the reader happy," and will pleasantly wile away the dog days for those who have "nothing else to do."

MONS. By ROBERT A. HALLAM, D. D., Rector of St. James' Church, New ondon, Connecticut, and author of "Lectures on the Morning Prayer." hiladelphia: Herman Hooker. 1856. pp. 310.

Ve are glad to see these Sermons by Dr. Hallam. His recent "Lectures on Morning Prayer," which we are pleased to state, have been received h great favor, and very generally circulated, prepare the way for the ual of these sermons, with the certainty of receiving rich and inctive lessons. The sermons here collected are mainly of a practical and deional character—and are admirably suited for family reading, and, with or two exceptions, for the lay reader also. We fully agree with the Epial Recorder, that many of these discourses are "imbued with that sweets of style and tone which makes the writings of Leighton on the one side, l Manning on the other, so very attractive."

ome of the texts, upon which the discourses are based, may strike the der oddly and lead him to wonder what lesson can be deduced therefrom, but manner in which the theme is handled, the sound practical Christian inction, which is evolved, will convince him that no passage of Holy Writ ithout meaning, and that all Scripture is "written for our learning."

he writings of Dr. Hallam are characterized by a certain quaintness of ression, which happily tends to attract and fix the attention, while his terse l piquant style and earnest manner, impress upon the mind of the reader great truths which he enunciates. The late hour at which this volume came and, forbids that examination which it deserves, and we can only refer our ders to the book itself for a confirmation of the opinions we have thus ofly expressed.

S WONDERS OF SCIENCE; OR, YOUNG HUMPHREY DAVY, (the Cornish Apothecay's Boy, who taught himself Natural Philosophy, and eventually became resident of the Royal Society.) The Life of a Wonderful Boy, written for oys. By HENRY MAYHEW, author of the "Story of the Peasant Boy Philoopher," &c. With Numerous Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 856. 16mo. pp. 452. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

ir Humphrey Davy, whose chemical discoveries contributed immensely to advancement of this branch of modern science, was as remarkable in his rhood as in his manhood. His genius and talent were both of a high order, l this story of his life by Mr. Mayhew, will be sure to strike a responsive rd in the breasts of many of our youth.

RERS' STORY BOOKS. A series of Narratives, Dialogues, Biographies, and ales, for the instruction and entertainment of the Young. By JACOB ABBOTT. mbellished with numerous and beautiful Engravings. No. 18. The Museum; or, Curiosities Explained.

n this little volume many curious things in Natural History, Mechanics, ography, &c., are explained for the amusement and instruction of the Young. e series will be sent regularly for three dollars a year, and the postage is y a trifle. It is a cheap and beautiful present for good little boys and ls.

LDNER'S ONE THOUSAND AND TEN THINGS WORTH KNOWING.—A book clearly exlaining how to do rightly almost everything that can be necessary in he Kitchen, the Parlor, and the Dressing Room, with Maxims, Receipts, &c., &c., &c. New York: H. Long & Brother. 1856. 12mo. pp. 143.

A APOSTOLICA.—First American, from the Fifth English Edition. New York: Thomas W. Stanford. 1856. pp. 262.

A series of poetical compositions, reprinted from the British Magazine, in ich they originally appeared. These poems, designed to illustrate important ristian truths, are many of them of great excellence, and will richly repay attentive perusal.

The following Pamphlets, &c., have been received:

Bishop Doane's Sermon; "The Church for Use," at the Institution of the Rev. J. W. Shackelford, Newark, N. J. Feb 12, 1856.

Rev. S. L. Southard's Sermon on "The Christian Measure," in St. John's Church Buffalo, N. Y.

Rev. J. H. Morrison's Sermon, "A Plea for Confirmation;" in St. Peter's Church, Baltimore, Feb. 17, 1856.

Rev. Thomas S. Bacon's Sermon; "A Defense of Street Preaching;" in Trinity Church, Natchitoches, La., Advent Sunday, 1855.

Parish Statistics of Christ Church, Elizabethtown, N. J., and Third Annual Address of the Rector, (Rev. Eugene Aug. Hoffman.)

Catalogue of the Berkeley Divinity School, at Middletown, Conn. 1856.

In this young and promising Institution there are in all eight Professors and Teachers, and already nineteen Students. Its facilities for thorough study and effective training are unsurpassed by any similar Institution in the country.

Rev. F. H. Cumings' Discourse, "The Prosperity of the Church promoted by Wardens and Vestrymen and other members of the Church;" in St. Mark's Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. Second Edition. 1856.

We copy the Appendix to this valuable Discourse, as follows, on the "Duties of Wardens and Vestrymen."

The duties of Wardens and Vestrymen are thus summarily defined in an early number of the Churchman's Magazine, published in New Haven, Connecticut

The duties of Wardens are,

1. To provide for the church a Prayer-Book and Bible of suitable size, at the expense of the parish.
2. To make the usual collections in the church.
3. To provide, at the expense of the parish, fine white bread and good wholesome wine for the Lord's Supper.
4. To provide a book of records, in which to enter, in the absence of a Rector, the names of persons baptized, married, or buried, with the date.
5. To present to the Bishop, or the chairman of the standing committee, every Priest and Deacon who has voluntarily relinquished his sacerdotal office, and uses the employments belonging to laymen.
6. To take care that the church be kept clean, and in good repair; and to preserve order during divine service.
7. To see that persons resort to church.
8. To prevent idle persons remaining in the churchyard, or about the doors of the church, during divine service.
9. To give an account to the Corporation of the church, if it has no treasurer, at the expiration of the year, of all moneys received and expended.

The duty of Vestrymen, or Trustees, is to transact all the temporal business of the church; to collect money stipulated to be paid to the minister, and at the expiration of the year if there be a deficiency, to give information thereof to the congregation, and if necessary to enforce the payment.

☞ Note.—We are compelled to omit a large number of Book Notices, prepared for this number of the Review.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Benton, M. B.	DeLancey,	April 6,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
Birdsall, E.	Upfold,	June 4,	St. Paul's, Richmond, Indiana.
Curtis, J. M.	Smith,	May 23,	St. John's, Louisville, Ky.
Dalton, Asa	Clark,	May 18,	Zion, Newport, R. I.
Davidson, W. F.	Cobbs,	March 28,	St. Paul's, Selma, Ala.
Davies, T. F.	Williams,	May 18,	Christ, Middletown, Ct.
Egar, John H.	Kemper,	May 18,	St. Sylvanus, Delafield, Wis.
Gregory, Luther,	Kemper,	May 18,	St. Sylvanus, Delafield, Wis.
Howard, R. S.	Burgess,	March 27,	St. Paul's, Brunswick, Me.
Hopkins, Wm. C.	Hopkins,	June 4,	St. Paul's, Burlington, Vt.
Jones, Lucius H.	Williams,	May 18,	Christ, Middletown, Ct.
Jope, Robert,	Johns,	March 16,	Chapel, Theological Seminary, Va.
Leffingwell, C. S.	Williams,	May 18,	Christ, Middletown, Ct.
McAuley, Wm.	Elliott,	May 12,	St. James', Marietta, Geo.
Peck, J. M.	Williams,	May 18,	Christ, Middletown, Ct.
Sever, W. W.	Eastburn,	March 19,	St. James', Roxbury, Mass.
Sellwood, James R. W.	Davis,	April 2,	St. Michael's, Charleston, S. C.
Seymour, Charles H.	Williams,	May 5,	St. Michael's, Litchfield, Ct.
Smith, T. H.	Johns,	April 27,	St. John's, Wheeling, Va.
Stryker, A. P.	Whittingham,	March 16,	Emanuel Parish, Cumberland, Md.
Thompson, H. M.	Kemper,	May 18,	St. Sylvanus, Delafield, Wis.
Williams, Selham,	Burgess,	May 18,	Christ, Gardiner, Maine.
Wood, H. G.	DeLancey,	May 25,	Zion, Rome, W. N. Y.
Wood, Robert,	McCoskry,	June 4,	Detroit, Mich.

PRIESTS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev. Atkinson, John,	Whittingham,	May 28,	St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md.
" Anthon, Edward,	Eastburn,	March 27,	St. Thomas', Taunton, Mass.
" Babcock, J. H.	Potter, H.	June 7,	Christ, Ballston Spa., N. Y.
" Beers, H. W.	Lee, H. W.	May 29,	St. John's, Dubuque, Iowa.
" Brainard, John,	Whittingham,	May 18,	St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md.
" Colburn, E. A.	Whittingham,	May 18,	St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md.
" Chase, R. F.	Eastburn,	May 14,	St. James', Salisbury Mills, Mass.
" Claxton, W. J.	McIlvaine,	March 14,	Trinity, Columbus, Ohio.
" Dickinson, L. R.	Clark,	May 18,	Zion, Newport, R. I.
" French, Louis,	Williams,	March 30,	St. Peter's, Milford, Ct.
" Gibson, Frederick,	Whittingham,	May 28,	St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md.
" Garrison, Jos. F.	Doane,	June 15,	St. Paul's, Camden, N. J.
" Hochuly, John,	McIlvaine,	March 14,	Trinity, Columbus, Ohio.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev. Kendig, Daniel,	Potter, A.	June 1,	St. Paul's, Chester, Penn.
" Morrell, H. H.	McIlvaine,	March 14,	Trinity, Columbus, Ohio.
" Pattison, E. C.	Uptold,	June 4,	St. Paul's, Richmond, Indiana.
" Pinkerton, S. J.	Elliott,	May 11,	St. James', Marietta, Geo.
" Patterson, Geo.	Atkinson,	April 27,	Holy Trinity, Hertford, N. C.
" Thrall, G. E.	Lee, A.	March 14,	Epiphany, Philadelphia, Penn.
" Trimble, James,	Lee, H.W.	May 29,	St John's, Dubuque, Iowa.
" Wallace, J. S.	Smith,	March 16,	St. Paul's, Louisville, Ky.
" Walden, J. T.	Doane,	May 19,	Trinity, Newark, N. J.
" Williams, Wm. H.	Williams,	May 21,	St. Mark's, New Canaan, Ct.
" Williamson, T. W.	Potter, A.	June 8,	St. James', Pittsburg, Pa.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Christ,	Johns,	April 20,	Clarksburg, Va.
Christ,	Meade,	June 7,	Roanoke Parish, Halifax Co., Va.
Grace,	Potter, H.	April 10,	Williamsburg, N. Y.
Messiah,	Davis,	April 13,	North Santee, S. C.
St. Andrew's,	McCoskry,	March 18,	Ann Arbor, Michigan.
St. James',	Elliott,	Feb. 10,	Great Ogechee, Geo.
St. Johns',	Williams,	April 10,	Warehouse Point, Ct.
St. John's,	Upfold,	June 5,	Hillsborough, Indiana.
St. John Chrysostom,	Kemper,	May 10,	Delafield, Wis.
St. Luke's,	DeLancey,	May 8,	Jamestown, W. N. Y.
St. Paul's,	Williams,	May 20,	Fairfield, Ct.
St. Stephen's,	Doane,	May 31,	Beverly, N. J.
St. Thomas',	Potter, H.	April 15,	Ravenswood, N. Y.
Trinity,	Potter, H.	June 17,	Haverstraw, N. Y.

OBITUARY.

The Rev. HIRAM R. HARROLD, Rector of St. Anne's Church, Middletown, Delaware, died April 28th, 1856, aged 53 years.

Mr. Harrold was taken away, after a short but severe illness, having officiated on Sunday, April 20, in his own Church, apparently in his usual health. On the Tuesday following, he was attacked with pneumonia, which proved fatal in less than a week.

The Episcopal Recorder says:

"Mr. Harrold enjoyed the esteem of a large circle of friends, and the respect and affection of his parishioners. He was diligent in the performance of the duties of his sacred office, and for many years cheerfully underwent labors from which many men of fewer years and more robust health would have shrunk.

"He had been for about twenty-two years in the ministry of the Episcopal Church, which he entered from convictions of duty, having previously ministered in connection with the Protestant Methodist Communion. The greater part of his ministerial life was spent in the Diocese of New Jersey, where he left behind him abiding monuments of his zeal, energy and perseverance. In 1849 he removed to Delaware, and took charge of the ancient and interesting parish of St. Anne's, officiating also for several years in Christ Church, Delaware City. During his ministry, the latter church, which he found unfinished, was completed, and St. Anne's Parish has been improved by the addition of a beautiful and convenient parsonage. The intelligence of his sudden decease occasioned general sorrow, and drew forth many evidences of affection on the part of the community in which he resided."

Bishop Doane in his Address to the late Convention in the Diocese of New Jersey, paid a warm and beautiful tribute to the memory of Mr. Harrold, from which we make the following extracts:

"HIRAM R. HARROLD was born in Trenton, New Jersey, August 20, 1803. His ancestors were of the Church of England; but through his immediate

ntage, he was of the Methodist connection; and, at 16, became openly a ıber of it. Ten years after that, he left that body, and became a Protestant hodist; and, subsequently, one of their ministers. The reason for this ıge was symptomatic of the next. He could not see how John Wesley, but esbyter, could originate a higher than presbyterial authority; or, how a ıop could proceed from Presbyters. His private journal, under date, ember 20, 1834, contains the following record:—'I was providentially led ıad Cooke's Essays on Episcopacy. I found his arguments so powerful, as to be gainsaid; and I was most reluctantly, and against my will, persua- of the divine origin and Apostolic succession of Episcopacy. I was in- ıd, in consequence of such convictions, to seek an interview with G. W. ne, Bishop of the diocese of New Jersey. I this day met him in the city hiladelphia, and the interview was all that I expected. * * * * Mr. Harrold was a remarkable man. If he had been thoroughly educated, world would have known it better. He was a natural mathematician. He oned logically. His taste for poetry was fine. And he held his faculties his attainments in a beautiful equipoise. He was not quick; but sure. ıt he knew, he knew well; and knew how to use. He was a keen ob- er of men and things; and the shrewdest remarker. He loved study; and no opportunity for it. To borrow a good book; to read it carefully, more ı once, and get all that was in it; and then to return it, rather better than se for his use of it, was the habit of his life. He loved to teach; and was a d teacher. In every way that he could, he promoted good learning.

* * * * * * * *

His illness was severe and short. It permitted no expression of his dying es. Its few utterances were devotional, and full of comfort. But he led not the preparation of a death-bed nor its tokens. He had lived a istian life. For twenty years he had been a missionary and a pastor. The panions of his life were the Bible and Prayer Book, and saintly Bishop ıon's *Sacra Privata;* and he suffered nothing to prevent his daily reading ıem. His latest sermon was, most appropriately, from these words of the ved Disciple: 'If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, ıs Christ the Righteous.' This had been the strength and consolation of life. This was the testimony of his death. His funeral took place on lnesday, 30th April."

IED, at St. James' Rectory, Hyde Park, N. Y., on Whitsunday, May 11th, the . REUBEN SHERWOOD, D. D., in his sixty-seventh year.

r. Sherwood, was one of the oldest clergymen of the Church, in Dutchess nty, and for the last twenty-two years of his life, was the esteemed Rector St. James' Church, Hyde Park. He was formerly for many years Rector of Church in Norwalk, Connecticut, and founded the Parishes at Saugerties Esopus, New York. The Church Journal pays the following tribute to his nory:

Dr. Sherwood's departure removes a landmark from among the clergy of Diocese. His position of simple, straight-forward, single-hearted perform- ; of what he believed to be *duty*, on *principle*, gained him the highest re- ıt of all, even of those who most widely differed from him. All will grieve ; the upright vigor of his hoary head, the firm Roman energy of his manly ıle, the gentle strength of his calm blue eye, shall no more be seen among and that the tones of his voice—slow, distinct, deliberate, yet tremulous h intense earnestness of emotion—shall no longer be heard in the Councils of Church. Few have passed as scathless as he, through the most exciting roversies of our day: few retire to rest crowned with higher honor in the rts of all whom he leaves behind."

fter the funeral, on the 15th of May, the clergy, a large number of whom e present, met as a body, and passed resolutions as a mark of respect for ir departed brother.

he Rev. GEORGE ADIE, late Rector of St. James' Church, Shelburn Parish,

Leesburg, Va., died at Greenwood, near Leesburg, May 3d. We extract from an obituary in the *Southern Churchman*, the following:

"For nearly a quarter of a century Mr. Adie has lived in our midst, as an irreproachable pattern of all that was good and manly and lovely in life. Coming among us twenty-five years ago, fresh with his commission to preach a gospel which he has lived, he has at length sealed his testimony to its truth and excellency, by a death as free from distress and gloom, as peaceful and lovely as the tenderest affection could have wished for him.

Gentleness, meekness, charity, a delicate instinctive shrinking from aught that was selfish or ostentatious; a lover of peace, and yet a fearless boldness in duty were the prevailing traits of his character. As a friend he was sincere and steadfast, forgiving and conciliating. As an adviser he was calm and judicious.

As a minister, he was beloved and reverenced by his brethren. They *could not* but love him, in that harmonious intercourse which has so long continued. Standing long as an older brother among the fathers of Israel, his well known face will no longer be seen in our Convention meetings, where he was always joyfully welcomed. His influence there was like the influence of the sun, quiet but strong.

At home, in his own church, his beloved St. James, his services have been acceptable and useful, till disease and weakness caused him again and again to resign his charge. Up to within a few weeks, he continued to preach in the church made vacant by his last resignation. How could he live and yet not proclaim that gospel which was the warrant of all his hopes of happiness. But his ministrations in these earthly tabernacles are at an end. As a king and priest washed in the blood of the Lamb, he serves before the altar in the heavenly sanctuary, night and day. His body sleeps under the shadow of the church in the green fresh sod on which so often he trod, but the glorified spirit is mingling in scenes of celestial brightness."

The Rev. JOHN K. HELMUTH, Assistant at St. James the Less, Falls of Schuylkill, died, April 27th.

The Rev. BREED BATCHELLER died, in the city of Baltimore, on Sunday morning, April 30th, aged 49 years. Mr. B. was a graduate of Dartmouth College—and for many years engaged in teaching, partly in Pendleton, S. C., and afterwards in Philadelphia. Having relinquished a handsome support from this source to devote himself to the ministry, he was ordained by Bp. A. Potter in 1846—7. He was settled for nearly two years at Radnor, Pa., and four years at Stanton, Delaware. For the last few years, he has resided in Maryland, but unable from ill health to discharge the duties of his sacred office.

DIED, at Nashotah, on Whitsunday, Rev. SAMUEL JOSIAH HAYWARD, B. D., a graduate of the Institution. One who knew him well writes:—

"Mr. Hayward was a young man at the time of his death, but of great acquirements and learning. He was a man of high moral worth and great strength of character. Respected and beloved by all that knew him, his considerate and childlike faith made him still more esteemed; and the hopes of many dwelt upon him as one that would do great things for the cause of Christ our Saviour and His Church.

"But their hopes were disappointed. He was attacked by consumption, and after spending a year and a half at the South, (in the Diocese of Mississippi, where he endeared himself to Bishop Green, and received much kindness from him,) without amendment of the disease, he hurried back, as he said, 'to die at Nashotah.' In the house of the Rev. Dr. Cole he spent the last two weeks of his life, attended and cared for as a brother by his family and the students of the Institution. His death was calm, without pain or struggle, in the peace of God and the full hope of a blessed resurrection. Let my soul be with his."

; Liverpool, Medina County, Ohio, on the 16th of April, JUSTUS WAR-
e age of 100 years and 20 days, in Communion with the Protestant
Church. Mr. Warner was born in Waterbury, Connecticut, and con-
Bishop Seabury, first American Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal
His father, Ebenezer Warner, who attained the age of 94, was one
mber who aided in erecting the first Episcopal Church in Water-
1742.

THE LEGAL CUSTODY OF THE DEAD.

rel and interesting question of the *legal right in a grave*, has recently
New York, under the following circumstances:
, the Corporation of the City of New York, in certain legal proceed-
idening Beekman street, from Park-row to Nassau street, took a por-
e cemetery of the Brick Presbyterian Church. The land thus taken
twelve private vaults for interment, and about eighty graves, and the
ded for it was $28,000.
ghter of a person who had been buried in one of these vaults, and
mains were duly identified by her, claimed the legal right to their
and to be indemnified out of the fund for the expense of re-interring
separate grave.
stions arising thereon were submitted by the Supreme Court, to Hon.
. Ruggles, as Referee, and his decision was subsequently confirmed in
ts by the Court. The general question presented, was this: Who is le-
primarily entitled to the custody of a dead body? and, as a necessa-
Who is legally bound to bury it? and, further, if a body be ejected
lace of burial, who, then, is legally and primarily entitled to its cus-
who is bound to rebury it?
feree, in his report, which is very long and elaborate, reviews the
ject, with great wealth of illustration and authority, and concludes
enting the following legal principles:
neither a corpse, nor its burial, is legally subject in any way, to eccle-
cognizance, nor to sacerdotal power of any kind.
t the right to bury a corpse and to preserve its remains is a legal
ich the Courts of Law will recognize and protect.
at such right, in the absence of any testamentary disposition, belongs
y to the next of kin.
at the right to protect the remains includes the right to preserve them
te burial, to select the place of sepulture, and to change it at pleasure.
t if the place of burial be taken for public use, the next of kin may
be indemnified for the expense of removing and suitably re interring
ins.

LOUISIANA.—THE MEMORIAL QUESTION.

ything relating to the "Memorial question," is of grave importance,
the interests of the Church in the United States, more seriously, per-
n any other that has been offered for her consideration, since she first
an independent ecclesiastical position, we give entire, the resolutions
subject, reported by a Committee to the recent Diocesan Convention
ana. This Committee were appointed at the Convention of that Dio-
55, for the purpose of considering and drafting replies to the circular
mmission of Bishops.
ing in their report, that weighty considerations alone should influence
ch to modify in any important particular, formularies of devotion,
ve already proved so effective, and become endeared by long usage,
the situation of the Church in Louisiana, amidst a people so diversi-

fied, seems to render her experience of special value, the Committee report the following resolutions:

Resolved, As the judgment of this Convention, that, in view of the actual position of our Church with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day, the period has arrived for the adoption of measures to meet these moral exigencies "more comprehensive than any provided for by our present ecclesiastical system," and that we repose the utmost confidence in the discretion of the Committee of Bishops, to whom this subject was referred by the House of Bishops, to suggest such wise and temperate measures with respect to the important matters presented in the "Memorial of Sundry Presbyters," as shall secure the general approbation of the Church, and promote her efficiency.

Resolved, That while this Convention, composed as it is of clergy and laity, assembled from different parts of the Diocese, without sufficient opportunity for mutual conference and careful deliberation, are not prepared to pronounce a specific judgment in answer to all the important questions presented in the circular, they would, nevertheless, embrace the occasion to record their conviction, that changes might be made in the liturgical services of the church, which, without touching any point of apostolic order, or doctrinal purity, as taught in her standards, would contribute towards a more perfect adaptation of her system "to the great social and moral necessities of the day," and so to make that system more efficient, and at the same time, render the public worship of the Church more varied and attractive—to wit: in answer to the questions embraced under the first number of the second division of the Bishop's Circular:

(*a*.) By shortening and dividing the morning service, leaving to the discretion of the minister, to use the Ante Communion Service, except on occasions when the Communion is to be administered, allowing the minister a privilege when the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated to omit what is called "Morning Prayer," beginning the Service with the Lord's Prayer and the Ante-Communion Service, according to early usage; allowing discretion in the use of the Litany.

(*b*) By adapting the Lessons, Anthems, &c., better to the different ecclesiastical seasons.

(*c*) By supplying a larger number of special services, and prayers, for special seasons.

(*d*) By admitting larger discretion in the use of hymns to be provided by the General Convention.

(*e*) By providing services especially fitted for missionary work, at home and abroad.

(*f*) By allowing the authorities of each Diocese larger liberty.

Resolved, That a readjustment of the Psalter in such wise, that the portion appointed for each day of the month should comprise psalms as nearly as possible of like character, penitential, jubilant, &c., would, in the opinion of this Convention, add much to the beauty of that part of the public service, and contribute to the edification of the congregation.

These resolutions, after a long and animated discussion, were adopted, with some amendments, of which the following were the chief:

1. That the minister's discretion in the use of the Litany, be subject to the approbation of the Bishop of the diocese.

2. That no step ought to be taken, which will, in the slightest degree, directly or indirectly touch or even tend to touch, any point of order or doctrine, as now taught in the standards of the Church.

We append, also, Resolutions upon the same subject, passed by the Convention of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, by a unanimous vote, and which have been since adopted by the Convention of the Diocese of Kentucky:

Resolved, That this Convention regard with deep interest, that great subject which will engage the attention of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at its approaching session, to wit: the feasibility of adopting some measures by which our church may be enabled to reach more effectually the masses of our population, that are as "sheep having no shepherd," and to

attract them to her worship, and moreover, to diffuse her divine and sacred endowments more widely among those who profess and call themselves Christians.

Resolved, That the objects above contemplated, are, in the judgment of this Convention, most desirable in themselves—that they appeal to the liveliest sympathies of the Christian heart, and that their grave consideration by the Chief Council of our church, will be an omen of present and prospective good.

Resolved, That this Convention commend these objects to the earnest thought, the enlarged charity and conservative prudence of their Right Reverend Fathers and their brethren, clerical and lay, under whose contemplation they may be brought for legislative action, and invoke upon them the especial guidance of the Great Head of the Church.

ROMISH CHURCH PROPERTY IN CONNECTICUT.

The Legislature of Connecticut in 1855, enacted that no grant, conveyance, lease or devise of personal or real estate, to any person and his successor or successors in any ecclesiastical office, or to any such person by the designation of any such office, should vest any estate or interest in said person or his successor. The act further provides, that all conveyances heretofore made to any person or persons in any ecclesiastical office, of real estate dedicated or appropriated to purposes of religious worship, or burial purposes, for the use of any congregation or society, shall be deemed to be held in trust for the benefit of the Society or congregation using the same, and upon the death of the person or persons who hold the title, that the same should vest in the religious corporation formed by the congregation occupying such estate—provided such a legally organized corporation should be in existence at the decease of the person holding the title. And further, that if no such incorporated religious society existed, that such real estate should vest in the State of Connecticut.

Since the loss of the Romish Bishop of the Diocese of Hartford, in the Pacific, has been ascertained, the question has arisen, what effect this act would have upon Romish Church property in this State. As none of the societies were incorporated at the time of the Bishop's death, it would appear that all the Church property became vested, at his death, in the State.

But the fifth section provides, that whenever such real estate shall vest in the State, it shall be the duty of the Treasurer of the State, upon being satisfied of the due incorporation of the congregation or society, who have occupied such real estate, to grant and convey the same, and all the right, title and interest of the State therein to said corporation. The result therefore of the law is to compel all Romish religious societies, if they would retain their property, to organize themselves, pursuant to the provisions of the State law, in the same manner as all other religious societies. At the same time, it effectually excludes the Romish Bishop and clergy from all legal control over the Church property, and places the temporalities of the Church where they should be, in the hands of the congregation. Such a result is certainly more in consonance with the spirit of our free and Republican institutions; and the Romish laity, if they are wise, will embrace this opportunity to free themselves from priestly control in matters of this kind.

OREGON.—THE SELLWOOD MISSIONARIES.

The first reports which reached us of the dreadful massacre at Panama, on the 15th of April, last, led many to the melancholy conclusion that the Rev. John Sellwood, then on his way with his brother to their field of labor in Oregon, had been removed from the scene of his earthly labors. We rejoice to say that this is incorrect. The following extract from a letter of Rev. James R. W. Sellwood, will be read with interest:

"We arrived in safety at Aspinwall, about 7 o'clock A. M., of Tuesday, April

15th, and at 2 o'clock P. M. we left Aspinwall, in the cars, to proceed to Panama; and at half-past 4 we arrived there, and were waiting in the railroad depot to get our tickets registered at the office, in order to embark on the steamer, when a difficulty took place between some of our passengers and natives of this place. Relying for protection on the proper authorities, I, together with my family and brother, and a number of other passengers, sat down on the floor at the farther end of the building. After a number of shots had been fired into the building from the outside, it was broken into at the end opposite to us, when a horrible massacre took place of the few persons who were there. Expecting that quickly the same would be the fate of the whole party at the end of the building where I was sitting, it was proposed by some one to rush out of the building, when my brother opened the door which was near him, and he and my youngest son ran out, and I knew nothing of what befell them until the next morning. At the same instant myself, wife, and the remainder of my children, in company with a number of my fellow-passengers, rushed out of the building through a doorway on the opposite side to which my brother and youngest son went out. We walked but a short distance, when we were stopped by an armed mob, who made all of us instantly sit on the ground, at the same time brandishing their large knives, and other weapons, over our heads, till I expected every one of us would be instantly killed; and I have no doubt they would have carried out their murderous purpose, had it not been for a man with a lace cap, who kept them in check for a few minutes, when we were permitted to pass on, conducted by this officer and several of his men to the governor's house, where we remained until the next morning. As soon as we were led out, I went (having procured a soldier as my guard) in search of my son and brother. I soon found my son. He had been taken to the house of a friend, by natives, and had only received a slight blow on the back of his head, and the loss of his hat. We then went to search for my brother. I went to the depot where I was told the dead were. I there saw twelve of the dead, but it was impossible to recognize him by features, if he had been there—they were so cut, swollen, and bloody. I found, by examining, that their clothing was not the kind my brother had on. I then went to a house where the wounded were, and found him, but did not know him, he was so swollen, bruised, and bloody; but, thanks to a kind Providence, he was sensible and knew my voice. His sad tale was this; when he opened the door he stepped out on the platform, and jumped from it to the ground, when he was surrounded by persons who struck him two or three blows on the forehead and face with a piece of wood. He also received a pistol-shot near the left breast. When he fell to the ground, they immediately drew their knives, and ripped up his clothes, and cut off portions of them, and robbed him of all he had about his person, and then left him. Both his hands are also severely injured,—when that took place is unknown to him,—his right hand being badly burned with powder, and the left hand supposed to be grazed by a ball. His wounds are all doing well. Myself and family are stopping at a hotel, by order of Colonel Ward, the American Consul. We are robbed of all our money, and also the mission funds, likewise hats, caps, bonnets, umbrellas—in fact, every thing we had in our hands."

At the last accounts Rev. Mr. S. was convalescing, and expecting soon to resume his journey. While in the hospital at Panama, a letter was dictated by him to Rev. Dr. Bedell. In response to an appeal for their aid, noble and liberal offerings were promptly made, to cheer these penniless Missionaries and enable them to proceed on their work of faith and love.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

MEETING OF CONVOCATION AGAIN.

The reports of the meetings of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, are becoming some of the most important of our English intelligence. Convocation reassembled on the 15th of April, when there were present ten bishops, and in the Lower House a large attendance. The Prolocutor and several members of the Lower House, presented an elaborate report on the state of the law affecting the discipline of the clergy, drawn up by a committee of the Lower House, appointed, by order of his Grace the President, at the session held February 1, 1856, which was thoroughly debated.

The *Bishop of Lichfield* presented a petition numerously and most respectably signed, both by laymen and clergymen of the Church of England, praying that the two houses would be pleased to take into their consideration the adoption of such measures as might seem expedient for bringing about the restoration of the Wesleyan Methodists to the communion of the Church of England. This subject also received respectful and earnest attention. The *Bishop of Lichfield* presented also a similar petition, numerously signed by clergymen of the diocese of London.

The *Bishop of Winchester* read the following "representation" from certain members of the Lower House of Convocation:

To his Grace the President, and their Lordships the Bishops, of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

"The humble representation of the following members of the Lower House of Convocation—

"We desire to unite with your lordships in expressions of devout thankfulness to Divine Providence for the restoration of peace.

"At the same time we beg leave to acknowledge your paternal care for the spiritual welfare of our fellow-subjects in the East during the late war.

"We desire also to record our gratitude for the encouragement given by your Grace and some of your lordships, to a pious work now in progress—the erection of an English Church at Constantinople.

"We hail this undertaking as an auspicious event, which promises, with the Divine blessing, to diffuse the benefits of the Gospel, and to promote the peace of Christendom.

"We would humbly submit to your lordships' consideration, that, for the attainment of these ends, it might be desirable that the foundation of the proposed Church at Constantinople, shall be accompanied with a communication from this Synod, expressive of sentiments of Christian fellowship, to the Bishops and clergy of the Eastern Church, and with such other demonstrations as, in your lordships' judgment, might seem most conducive to promote the cause of true religion and Christian unity, and to represent the Church of England to our Eastern fellow-Christians in her true character as a pure and apostolic branch of the Universal Church of Christ." (Signed)

"Anthony Grant, Archdeacon of St. Albans.
Chr. Wordsworth, D. D., Proctor for the Chapter of Westminster.
Thomas Thorp, B. D., Archdeacon of Bristol.
George Wilkins, D. D., Archdeacon of Nottingham.
James Wayland Joyce, Proctor, Hereford.
E. Harold Browne, Proctor for the Diocese of Exeter.
Henry Caswall, Proctor for the Diocese of Salisbury.

F. C. Massingberd, Proctor for the Diocese of Lincoln.
J. Bartholomew, Archdeacon of Barnstable.
George A. Denison, Archdeacon of Taunton.
William Selwyn, Proctor for the Chapter of Ely.
R. W. Jelf, Proctor for Christ Church, Oxford.
Edward Bickersteth, Archdeacon of Buckingham.
George Martin, Proctor for the Chapter of Exeter.
James Duke Coleridge, D.C.L., Proctor for the Diocese of Exeter.
Henry Moore, Archdeacon of Stafford.
William Bruere Otter, Archdeacon of Lewes.
Robert Hussey, B.D., Proctor for the Diocese of Oxford."

These were among the most important matters brought before Convocation; and after *three days* of free, and often spirited discussion, Convocation was prorogued to August 28th. The whole tone of the meeting was different from that exhibited in the earlier meetings of which we gave an account two years ago. There is still, however, the presence of an impracticable "*dog-in-the manger*" spirit; in other words, there are large numbers of men who are terribly afraid the Church is not so thoroughly and dignifiedly dead and laid out in state for burial as they supposed. Good temper characterized the whole meeting; no unpleasant collision took place; and the general business of the meeting seemed to fall into those hands which were best able to conduct it.

The *London Record* speaks of Convocation in the following strain: "The Convocation of the clergy for the province of Canterbury, is again at work, maintaining its groundless and mischievous usurpation of the character belonging to a general Convocation of the Church of England. Whatever of plain good sense has been exercised on the present occasion, has been shown by the Lower House, while the usual despotic assumption and spirit of intolerance have marked the proceedings of the Upper Chamber. * * * *

"For the Lower House, we confess a kind of ludicrous pity. Did it really represent the general body of the Church of England, that pity would be changed into indignation; for it would present to the world a picture of helpless weakness which might well excite the wonder of mankind, and for which it would be difficult to find a parallel." * * * * * * *

The attempt to restore to Convocation the exercise of its legitimate functions, is shared by men of different shades of opinion; who feel the necessity of rescuing the Church from the grasp of a Body like Parliament, made up more and more of Romanists, Jews, Heretics, Latitudinarians, &c., &c.

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE IN ENGLAND.

Attention is now directed to the important subject of the increase of the Episcopate in England. The *Colonial Church Chronicle* for April has the following statistics:

The great necessity that exists for an increase in the Episcopate in England, will at once appear, when we state that on an average, every Bishop in England has nearly 270,000 *more* souls under his spiritual care, *than any other Bishop in any other Christian country in Europe*, whilst the population of some of our Dioceses, committed to the pastoral care of *one Bishop*, is equal to some European kingdoms! and in one case exceeds several of them.

Thus the number of souls contained in 1851 in the Diocese of London was 2,143,340, (to be increased on the next voidance of the see of Winchester to 2,588,718,) in that of Manchester 1,395,494, in that of Chester 1,183,497, in that of Winchester 1,080,412, in that of Ripon 1,033,457, and in that of Lichfield 1,022,080. Compare this with the population of some of the minor European kingdoms. In 1850 Saxony contained 1,836,433 inhabitants, Hanover 1,758,856, Wirtemburg, 1,743,827, and the Grand Duchy of Baden 1,349,930. Can any stronger argument be drawn in favor of an increase in an Episcopate than a comparison of these statistics affords? We think not. We leave them without remark, to speak for themselves.

The following statistics are chiefly taken from the Report of the Cathedral Commission:

	Bishops.	Souls in 1851.	Average in each Bishopric.
England and Wales has	27	18,018,348	667,346
France	82	33,000,000	400,000
Bavaria	8	3,000,000	375,000
Austria	78	28,000,000	358,000
Sweden	13	3,000,000	230,000
Spain	59	12,000,000	203,000
Portugal	22	2,500,000	113,000
Sardinian States	40	4,600,000	110,000
The Two Sicilies	24	8,500,000	106,000
Free Greece	24	1,000,000	41,666

In the time of William the Conqueror the number of Episcopal sees in England was twenty-one, the population about 1,250,000—average to each see 180,000. We have now, including Sodor and Man, (1856,) twenty-eight Bishoprics, with a population exceeding nineteen millions—average to each Diocese 678,574.

UNION OF THE ENGLISH WESLEYANS WITH THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

At the close of last year a meeting was held at St. James' Rectory, Piccadilly, at which the desirableness of union amongst Christians was discussed. The result was that a few of the clergymen and gentlemen present were requested to consider and report "what measures it may be expedient to take for promoting union with the Church of England on the part of Christians not at present in active communion with her." The following committee was appointed, including four names which were added subsequently:—

Chairman.—Rev. J. E. KEMPE, Rector of St. James', Westminster.

Rev. R. Burgess, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Upper Chelsea; Rev. Dr. Hessey, Preacher to the Hon. Society of Gray's-inn, and Head Master of Merchant Taylor's School; Rev. Ernest Hawkins, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Minister of Curzon Chapel, Mayfair; Rev. Lord C. A. Harvey, Rector of Chesterford, Essex; Rev. J. W. Ayre, Incumbent of St. Mark's, North Audley street; Henry Hoare, Esq., 14 New street, Spring gardens; T. Chambers, Esq., M. P., 7 Cumberland Place, Hyde-park; Rev. Henry Alford, Minister of Quebec Chapel; Rev. J. Lawrell, Incumbent of St. Matthew's, City Road; Rev. W. H. Hoare, Oakfield, Crawley, Sussex. *Hon. Secs.*—Rev. J. Paul, Incumbent of Twigworth, Gloucester; Rev. A. C. Smith, of St. Andrew's, Holborn.

By this Committee a report was made to a large meeting at St. James' Rectory, Piccadilly, on Thursday evening, March 6. The result of the conversation that ensued was the proposal of the following petition to Convocation, founded mainly on the report, and expanding the resolutions contained in it. It was then numerously signed, and will lie at Messrs. Rivington's, 3 Waterloo-Place, for general signature:

"*The humble Petition of the undersigned Clergy and Laity of the Church of England to the Most Rev. the Archbishop, the Right Rev. the Bishops, and the Rev. the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled, showeth*—

"That your petitioners, seriously laying 'to heart the great dangers we are in, by our unhappy divisions,' and earnestly desiring a closer union among Christians, have been led in the first instance to review the causes which impede the restoration to the Church of England of one particular religious community, namely, the Wesleyan Methodists.

"That your petitioners are given to understand that among the chief difficulties in the way of such reunion are the following:—

"1. An impression on the part of the Wesleyans that the Church of England is not sufficiently careful with respect to the ordination of candidates for the ministry, or sufficiently jealous of the personal holiness of her ministers and other members.

"2. A persuasion that the Wesleyan system of 'class-meetings' would be formally disapproved by the Church of England.

"3. A strong objection to the imposition of a three years' silence on a Wesleyan minister before he can be Episcopally ordained.

"4. A suspicion that in promoting union the Church of England desires to obtain patronage, or temporal influence."

"That your petitioners desire to meet these difficulties in the spirit of Christian candor and Christian charity.

"They beg leave, therefore, humbly to represent to your two houses as follows:—

"That they desire most earnestly that every precaution should be taken to ensure personal holiness and other necessary qualifications in candidates for the sacred ministry of the Church, and that none should be admitted to holy orders but such as can answer conscientiously the questions put to every candidate in the Ordination Service—a test which, if faithfully applied, they are satisfied would secure, so far as human means can be expected to secure, an efficient and godly ministry.

"That with reference to the personal holiness of the clergy and other members of the Church of England, they would cordially rejoice if better means could be devised than at present exist for the exercise of godly discipline.

"That in the opinion of your petitioners the retention by the Wesleyans of their system of 'class-meetings' need not be an insuperable obstacle to their reunion with the Church.

"That in respect to the admission of a Wesleyan minister to the orders of the Church of England, your petitioners submit that it would be proper to retain the requirement of a three years' testimonial, so far as regards life and behavior; but as regards soundness in the faith, and general fitness for the sacred ministry, they think it desirable that the period of probation be reduced, and that no longer time be prescribed than the Bishop may require to satisfy himself on those essential points.

"That your petitioners disclaim all wish to interfere with the property or patronage of the Wesleyan body.

"That, whilst anxious for the removal of every unnecessary barrier between the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodists, your petitioners cannot refrain from saying that they would entertain better hopes of eventual reconciliation, could the Wesleyans be induced to revert to the principles of their founder, by receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the parish church only.

"Lastly—That your petitioners desire humbly to represent to your two houses that, aiming as they do, at the restoration of union, they would heartily rejoice to see such of the Wesleyan ministers as are already in mind and spirit one with the Church of England, united to her by Episcopal ordination, and so placed in a position to co-operate with her clergy as fellow-laborers in the vineyard of their common Lord and Master.

"Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your two houses will be pleased to take the premises into your serious consideration, and to advise upon such measures as to you may seem most expedient for bringing about a restoration of the Wesleyan Methodists to the communion of the Church of England.

"And your petitioners will ever pray."

ARCHBISHOP OF MALABAR IN ENGLAND.

An ecclesiastic of the Eastern Church is now in England, whose presence and errand awaken associations of much interest. It will be recollected that in

806 the Rev. C. Buchanan, in his missionary journey to the East, found a hurch on the coast of Malabar reputed to have been founded by St. Thomas, nd though exposed to papal aggressions in the sixteenth century, when the ortuguese visited Southern India, yet still preserving their own integrity. heir existence and character has been regarded as furnishing an unanswera- le argument on the Constitution, worship, &c., of the primitive Church. The rchbishop of that ancient branch of the Church is now in England, and the ev. James Skinner, the gentleman whose guest he is, thus describes him:

"It was in the month of December of last year that I met Mar Athanasius tephanos, the Archbishop and Metropolitan of Malabar, in Cairo. He was n his way to England to seek redress, at the hands of the Court of Directors f the East India Company, against the injustice of the Rajah of Travancore, he heathen prince in whose territory he exercises his jurisdiction. I will not nter into the details of his grievance. It may prejudice his interests to speak ublicly of statements which have yet to be laid before the authorities. I will nly say that, if I am rightly informed, they make out a case of singular hard- hip; and they bring before the Church at large a fresh testimony to that uni- ersal shortcoming in brotherly love to which I have referred.

But who is the Archbishop of Malabar? There is hardly any tradition so ell sustained as that the Gospel was first preached in India by the Apostle t. Thomas. First in order came the conversion of Arabia Felix and the island f Zocotrœ; and then the Apostle planted the faith in the town of Cranganor, ying north of Cochin. And so the Church of Malabar came, in process of time, o include all the labors of the Apostle in this part of India, from Cranganor o Cape Comorin; and there is every reason to believe that it continued steadfast or some centuries in the things which it had learnt from its blessed founder.

But time wore on. And as in other parts of Christendom, so in this, the ower of money wrought all manner of evil. A Syrian merchant, in the sixth r seventh century, coming with all the influence of wealth and of a coinci- lence in name, (Thomas,) persuaded the simple Malabarese to receive their ishops from the Patriarchate of Antioch; and with their Bishops they re- eived also the Nestorian heresy. Their subsequent history is one of great rouble. In the palmy days of the Indo-Portuguese Church, an attempt was nade to bring them under the supremacy of Rome; but this only resulted in a iolent revulsion of feeling against that communion, which abides with them o this day. It resulted, farther, in their yielding themselves up to Jacobitism, hich also cleaves to them still.

The Archbishop of Malabar then, at present in England, is the appointed hief minister to the Syrian Christians in Cochin and Travancore. The Jacobite 'atriarch of Antioch, residing in the Convent of Ananias, at Mardin, near Mosul, o whom the Christians of Malabar submit themselves, is his superior; and to ssert this authority in his superior, and to claim the privilege to which his uperior has called him, he has come to this country.

Now, Sir, I believe this prelate to be a true man. I have the testimony of ompetent authority—our political agent and Consul at Bagdad, Col. Rawlinson; ur Vice-Consul at Mosul, Mr. Rassam; the Bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and ombay; Mr. Kay, of Bishop's College, Calcutta; Mr. Woodrow, of La Marti- iere, Calcutta, and others, who have examined his credentials, and who wit- ess to their authenticity. And I venture to suggest that we should make him welcome amongst us, because of the common bond which binds us to Christ. He is identified with a fatal heresy, I am sure, without believing in, or so much s guessing its sin. The founder of it, Severus, repudiated the notions of Euty- hes as much as we do, and he also declined to leave the dogma of one or two atures in Christ an open question. So that it may well be conceived how *sim- le ignorance* may be the one fault of his followers. I am solemnly persuaded hat our connection with this prelate and his Church, through the East India ompany, involves us in a high responsibility. I am solemnly persuaded hat their adoption to the Catholic faith, *from England*, is an issue which, as it ndoubtedly lies with us now, will assuredly be demanded of us "at That Day."

The Archbishop is now living with me, and attends our daily services here.

It is very striking to witness his appreciation of a higher standard of worship than that with which he has been accustomed to identify the Anglo-Indian Church, as represented at Calcutta and Madras. And this is not without its significance."

TREATY OF PEACE SIGNED.

The Treaty was signed at Paris on Sunday, March 30th, at 12 o'clock. A Council of Ministers was held at the Tuileries at half-past 11 o'clock, and remained sitting till quarter-past 12. The Emperor presided and gave his last instructions, and Count Walewski returned to his official residence to receive the Plenipotentiaries. They appeared in full uniform, and wore all their orders and decorations. They assembled in the *Salle de Conferences* before half-past 1, and after the Treaty was read over proceeded to sign it in the same alphabetical order in which they have been wont to take their places during the Conferences.

The Plenipotentiaries of France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, affixed their signatures to the Treaty.

When matters shall have settled down into their practical and working order we shall then be able to see clearly who has lost, and who has gained; and where Turkey, Popery, Italy, the English Church, and the Oriental Churches stand relatively to each other and before the world. The Sultan's Firman secures entire freedom for Christians in the East; but who is to profit most by this remains to be proved, and will, doubtless, depend on the influence most predominant at Constantinople. That ultra-montane Popery is making large calculations we have sufficient evidence. Its organ in France, thus speaks:

"The best reliance for us is, therefore, that which appears to have the same interests as ourselves at Constantinople—namely, the alliance of Austria. France has a great task to accomplish in those splendid regions still submitted to the authority of the son of Mahmoud, which is to establish, by the influence of her civilization, the ascendency of Catholicism. Her *rôle* is to place herself at the head of the Catholic interests in the East. United to Austria, she can perform great actions and acquire at the same time immense advantages and much glory."

Will England permit herself to be in this game a mere cat's paw of the Jesuits? Will she still join the despots of Europe in crushing Constitutional Liberty in Italy? If she dare do it, there is another and deeper game to be played nearer home.

It is noticeable that the manifesto of Alexander in announcing peace to his Russian subjects is deeply religious in its tone. It thus closes:

"The concessions are not great when put in comparison with the charges of a prolonged war, and the advantages promised to us by the tranquillity of the Empire the destinies of which it has pleased God to intrust to us. May all those advantages be obtained by our efforts, united to those of all our faithful subjects! May, with the aid of the Almighty, who has always protected Russia its internal organization be consolidated and perfected! May justice and clemency preside over its judgment—may the advancement of civilization and of all useful activity spread with renewed force—and may every one enjoy in peace the fruits of his labor under the protection of laws equally just and watchful for all! Finally, and this is the most important and most ardent of our hopes may the salutary light of faith, by enlightening the mind and strengthening the heart, maintain and improve more and more that social morality which is the surest pledge of order and happiness!

Given at St Petersburg, the 19th (31st) of March, 1856, and in the second year of our reign ALEXANDER."

What American President has ever borne such testimony to the Christian Faith!

The following is the substance of the Treaty as far as made known. It contains thirty-four articles:

The First restores perpetual friendship between Great Britain, Sardinia, Turkey, France, and Russia.

Second—All territories conquered or occupied during the war shall be reciprocally evacuated as soon as possible.

Third—Russia restores to Turkey Kars and other parts of the Ottoman territory.

Fourth—The Allies restore to Russia the towns and ports of Sebastopol, Balaklava, Kamiesch, Eupatoria and Kertch. [Articles 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th are wanting.]

Ninth—The Sultan communicates to the Powers his *firman* granting equality to Christians which the contracting Powers must approve of, but divest themselves of all right thereby to interfere in the internal administration of the Government of the Ottoman Empire.

Tenth—The Convention of the 13th July, 1841, closing the Bosphorus and Dardanelles is reaffirmed.

Eleventh—The Black Sea is neutralized and forever forbidden to all ships of war of every Power adjoining or distant, with the exceptions specified in articles 14 and 19.

Twelfth—Trade shall be free in the waters and ports of the Black Sea, subject only to police regulations, Russia and Turkey admitting Consuls to all ports on its shores.

Thirteenth—The Black Sea being neutralized, strongholds become useless—consequently Turkey and Russia agree neither to construct nor preserve any military maritime arsenals on the coast.

Fourteenth—The Convention regulating the force of ships for coast-service is concluded individually between Turkey and Russia, but is appended to this treaty, and cannot be altered without general assent.

Fifteenth—The act of the Congress of Vienna relative to river navigation is applied to the Danube and its mouths, and its freedom becomes a part of the law of the Empire.

Sixteenth—To carry into effect Article 15, France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia and Turkey, appoint each a delegate to put the River in a navigable state, from Isatcha to Tza.

Seventeenth—Austria, Bavaria, Turkey and Wurtemburg, each add a delegate to the Commission of the Principalities, to form a permanent Commission for the purpose of keeping the River navigable, and to superintend its police.

Eighteenth—The general Commission will be dissolved in two years, and the permanent Commission take its place.

Nineteenth—Each of the contracting Powers may station two small ships at the mouth of the Danube.

Twentieth—Russia assents to the rectification of the Bessarabian frontier. The new frontier starts from the Black Sea, one mile East of Lake Bourna Sola to the Akermann Road, along which it extends to the valley of Trajan, passing South of Belgrade, and reascending the River Yalpack to Savatsika, and terminates at Karmari on the River Pruth. Elsewhere it is unchanged.

Twenty-first—The ceded territory is annexed to Moldavia.

Twenty-second—Moldavia and Wallachia continue under the sovereignty of Turkey, with the guarantee of all the contracting Powers that no Power shall claim the individual right of interference.

Twenty-third—The Porte guarantees to the said Principalities the continuance of the freedom of religion and commerce. The contracting Powers appoint a Commission to meet immediately at Bucharest, to report on the present condition and wants of the Principalities.

Twenty-fourth—The Porte will immediately convoke a Divan in each Principality to learn the wishes of the people as to their definite organization.

Twenty-fifth—Minutes thereof shall be sent to Paris, where the Constitution shall be framed, which the Porte shall promulgate.

TWENTY-SIXTH——The Principalities shall maintain a militia, and may construct works of defense approved by the Porte.

TWENTY-SEVENTH—If the internal tranquillity of the Principalities be disturbed the Porte must consult the contracting Powers, and cannot employ armed intervention without their consent.

TWENTY-EIGHTH—Servia continues a dependency of the Porte under the guarantee of the Powers, and retains its national administration, and freedom of religion and trade.

TWENTY-NINTH—The right of garrison in Servia is reserved to the Porte, but no armed intervention is permitted without the consent of the Powers.

THIRTIETH—Russia and Turkey retain their possession in Asia precisely as before the war, but their frontiers are to be marked out by survey.

THIRTY-FIRST—The evacuation of Turkey by the Allied and Austrian forces shall take place as soon as convenient. The time and manner of such evacuation shall be the subject of private arrangement between each of the Powers and Turkey.

THIRTY-SECOND—Until new arrangements shall be made, trade shall go on as before the war.

THIRTY-THIRD—A convention (contents secret) concluded between France England and Russia respecting the Aland Isles, shall be appended to this treaty.

THIRTY-FOURTH—The ratifications shall be exchanged at Paris within four weeks.

REVIVAL OF POPERY IN FRANCE.

We learn from various sources that extraordinary efforts are now making to establish the most ultra-Romanism throughout France.

Among these methods is the revival of Triennial Synods, under the immediate sanction of Rome. The Synod of Rochelle has just published its 'Acts,' and a powerful synodal letter. It is most remarkable for its contrast to the old Gallican spirit—a contrast which it cannot conceal by its respectful allusion to Fenelon. Absolute devotion to the 'See of St. Peter,' expressed in such extravagant terms as the synod of 1682, is repeated in this; and the 'independence of the Church' remarkably asserted. Among the principal topics of the synodal letter are the most earnest persuasions, to the strict revival of 'the Sabbath.' Most of the irreligion of the people is attributed by the Synod to disregard of the Divine law which 'sanctifieth the seventh day.' The Fathers of the Church then solemnly call on the priests everywhere to set an example of Sabbath observation, and admonish 'heads of families, masters, and magistrates—in a word all who have received authority from God,—to use it in glorifying the Sovereign Master, and *procure the observation of His Law*.'"

Notwithstanding this, An American gentleman now in France, describes the increased attention paid to the young. He says: "The Church is devoting extraordinary attention to the children of the country. It has found that it cannot make good Papists of Protestant men, whatever it may do with French women; it must, and does therefore early work in its spirit. The children of both sexes, but especially boys, receive more careful attention from the French Catholic clergy than is useful to them in any other country I have ever seen. More attention than ever is given here to the preparation of the young for their '*first communion*.' It is made a great event in families. The child is trained for it by devotional forms, and a new apparel is provided for the occasion, or if the family is too poor to provide it, it is obtained, for a small sum, from shops which have it on hire, and charge a small sum for its use.

"And let me remark that these assemblies, and initiations of children into the Church are not considered here secondary religious labors, to be assigned to Sunday schools or summer afternoons, but the highest solemnities, and the highest dignitaries of the Church give them importance. I have seen the Archbishop of Paris (the primate of all France) solemnize the mass, and deliver an address in the splendid church of the Pantheon, to a congregation of thousands of boys, apparently between the ages of ten and fifteen years.

"The Church also organizes special *societies* (like those mentioned in my last letter) for the better security of its children. It has seminaries for all grades and all pecuniary ability, and for children whose parents have no such ability. It encloses the daughters of the rich, amidst papal symbols and ceremonies, in institutions scattered all over France, of which the 'House of the Sacred Heart,' at Paris, and the 'Demoiselle d'Instruction,' at Puy, are well-known examples. Public nurseries and infant asylums abound. Two things are well taught in these Papal institutions—the legendary superstitions and formalism of Popery, on the one hand, and the detestation of Protestantism on the other. It would astonish you to read the descriptions of the latter which the juvenile books contain. Let me insert here the 'table of contents" of one of these volumes, which has been endorsed by a bishop!—

"Question I. What ought you to think of a religion which had its origin in libertinism?

Question II. What ought you to think of a religion which has spread and strengthened itself by plunder and violence?

"Question III. What ought you to think of a religion which still supports itself by the aid of violence?

"Question IV. What ought you to think of a religion which depends on falsehood and calumny?

"Question V. What ought you to think of a religion which allows its professors to believe and to do whatever they like?

"From this specimen you may infer what instructions respecting Protestantism are given to the children of France. Trained thus to abhor it, they have no refuge, when, in riper years, their own monstrous faith becomes intolerable. They plunge into the abyss of scepticism.

"The Work of the Holy Infancy extends everywhere with a marvelous rapidity. From France it now sends its beneficent branches to the British Isles, Belgium, Holland, the Rhenish Provinces, Bavaria, Poland, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Asia, North and South America, &c.

"The churches are crowded, old ones are 'restored,' magnificent new ones are opened, religious fetes, costly pageants, abound everywhere; nearly one hundred and thirty-three thousand priests, monks and nuns are at work incessantly in all the cities and hamlets of the land; they have increased nearly one-fourth in the last twenty-five years."

Still another mode to revive Popery in France is the new zeal inspired in and by the Order of Dominicans. These are an order of mere preachers. Without parochial connection they are carefully trained to the mere business of preaching. The head of this Order now is Lacordaise, a remarkable man, and a thorough ultra-montanist. Much as we hear now-a-days about the folly of preaching, the Papists are not such dunces as to undervalue it. These itinerants thread every nook and corner of the Empire where they can gain a hearing, just as our own preachers ought to penetrate every nook and corner of our own country.

And yet to this spread of ultra-montanism there are serious obstacles. True the Bishops of France, with few exceptions, are of that school. Yet it is also true that the present *civil* despotism of France may be short-lived. It hangs upon a single thread, the life of a single man. As to this subserviency to the Pope in every thing, the intellect of France, and the genius of the people, are all against it. Many of her noblest sons are in exile, her press is under censorship, and the battle of the ancients and the moderns has been revived. The following passage from the writer above cited, is worth quoting:

"The *coup d'etat* of their patron, Napoleon III, was immediately followed by their attempt to displace the classic authors, and the great French writers who copied after them, and to substitute in their place in the seminaries the Church fathers and Medieval doctors. This was simply ridiculous; and it could be nowhere more so than among the brilliant critics and authors of France. Homer and Demosthenes, Virgil and Cicero, Cameille and Racine, Rousseau and Voltaire, Boileau and Moliere, and even Bossuet and Fenelon,

were not as good standards of style and taste as Thomas Aquinas, Chrysostom, or Augustine! In other words, the fight was for the restoration of the dark ages: for Popery knows that they alone could contend with its antiquated pretensions. The public paper of the Church, the Univers, has not hesitated to declare that the reign of St Louis was the most intelligent as well as the most happy epoch of the French, and in contrast with these respects, with that of Louis XIV. and the most illustrious writers of the national literature.

"The Abbé Gaume has led this controversy by his writings against the modern and their (alas!) French followers. He has been supported by the Bishop of Arras. The attempt, however, is so exceedingly barbarous that the Church itself has become alarmed. The more astute heads within it see that this fight against the demi-gods of literature must end like that of the Titans against the Olympic gods. A Bishop even of Orleans has stepped forth to stop it. But it has already gone far enough to stamp its disgrace indelibly upon the Ultramontane cause. It is a part of a general scheme for the permanent establishment of Popery in all the departments of French powers and French thought. It is one of the overbore builders of Jesuitism, which will in due time lay the reproach that shall overwhelm it."

"There is hardly one contemporary name among the priests, which can pretend to a place among the great French enrolment of the past. Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Fénelon, Fleschier, Arnold, Pascal, still constitute the chief stars of the French Church in the constellation of intellectual Frenchmen. They have no successors. They were legitimate sons of the Gallican Church, in the day of its liberties, and they most of them defended those liberties, and would bind for the present Ultramontanism with which Jesuitism has bewitched the society. Their expiring elements were the precinct of the 'classic' era of French studies—the day of the consecrated scholarship of the Port-royalists and of the memory of the Elzevir and Delphine editions. Their names are imperial in the history of French literature—the only ones of the Church, that in the great Protestant times to come, without a blush in the same sentence with the great infidel names of Voltaire, Lousseau, Montesquieu, Mirabeau. Their day seems irrevocably gone in France. The priests print—print incessantly, and deluge the country with their productions, but what are they? Mostly the vilest trash of superstition—'lives of the saints,' that is histories of legends—sermons and manifold books of devotion—inflated and sometimes quite amorous books on the favorite Mariolatry of the day."

Among the most striking proofs that the old Gallican spirit is not dead, the editors of *Le Siecle*, the organ of the moderate party recently addressed the following scorching invective to *L'Univers*, the organ of the Jesuits.

"You are the men who wrote the Code of the Inquisition, the greatest crime of human law; who shed blood like water in the wars of the Albigenses, of the Waldenses and of the Cevennes; who butchered old men, women, and children, and shall, with unfeeling brutal foot heaps of corpses. God will know who you are. You who first stained the earth with the blood of the Moors and proscribed the Jews; who watched the Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's day, blessed the daggers of Jacques Clement and Ravaillac, and poured upon Europe the thirty years' war, sometimes, it seems the genius who most transformed Flanders, by the hand of the Duke of Alva, into an immense slaughter-house, burnt Giordano Bruno at the stake, tortured on the rack the gold of Galileo, extorted from Louis XIV the revocation of the edict of Nantes, burnt four hundred villages in the Cevennes, signed a hundred thousand orders of cachet warrants against the Jansenists, confounded Jesus Christ and Satan, flayed Fra Diavolo, killed at Rome Gen. Duphot, shook at the Restoration against the law of sacrilege, as a trial level at the Revolution, and finally ruined France, during the restoration, to end a degree that after a long resistance, France indignantly punished you. Do you recognize yourselves in this description of your services, and in the long train of blood, you have left behind you on the road of the past? Do you begin to find out what your family name is? Your name is not religion, for religion is peace in the State, whilst, wherever you set your foot, we find noth-

g but *discord*. No power, no people, has been able to live within the reach your breath, without being poisoned, and vomiting you back."

Nor is this all.

"It seems ultramontanism is not to be without antagonism in France. A w paper, *L'Observateur*, Catholique, is to combat ultramontanism, 'which at-aks the church in her power, rights and discipline.'"

The strength of Protestantism in France, he thus estimates. He places, of the two great Protestant bodies which are recognized by the state in France -the 'Reformed' and the 'Lutheran'—their population at about 2,000,000, eir ministers 762, their chapels 800, their theological professors (including ose of Geneva) 20, their theological students 100, their annual receipts from he government $272,000, their periodicals about 17, &c."

While he writes on the whole in a hopeful spirit, yet he makes the following nfession:

"*Rationalism*, under the guise of 'Liberalism,' has been the bane of French rotestantism, as of continental Protestantism generally. It would be incred-le to American Christians were I to sketch the character and prevalence of ationalistic unbelief in Germany and France. Mr. Parker, of Boston, with s apparent earnestness of character and devotion to public philanthropies, ight pass for a saint of orthodoxy by the side of some Protestant speculators Europe. An American friend, recently here from Berlin, tells me that he tended a course of lectures, in a Protestant university, expressly against the aracter, personal as well as official or ecclesiastical, of Jesus Christ, and that ey were delivered by a learned man, whose character was reputable for ind morals and general amiability. Christ is placed in the same class of storical characters as Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates and Mahommed, and bjected to the same critical treatment. All sorts of critical liberties are ken, in like manner, with the sacred writings."

In respect to the preaching in Germany, he says:

"It seems scarcely credible, and yet it is distinctly asserted by Kappt, that rmons have been preached in German churches, upon the cultivation of the otatoe, the advantages and disadvantages of tobacco, the management of ani-als and stables, upon the seasons, the holidays, and other equally ridiculous hemes."

AUSTRIA AND POPERY.—THE NEW CONCORDAT.

While Popery is fast losing ground in Italy, Spain, Sardinia, and elsewhere new Concordat has been signed between Rome and Austria of the most sweep-g character, and by which rights always held sacred by Austria have been iven up. The Pope, in his Allocution of Nov. 3, is in ecstacies over the mat-er.

An account of the Concordat between Rome and Austria has been given in wo papers, the *Gazetta di Venezia* and the Paris *Univers*. According to the ormer, translated from the German by the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*, he document contains the following twenty-six articles:—

"1. The Roman Catholic religion is to be maintained and protected, with all he rights and privileges secured to it by the sacred canons, in all those prov-nces in which it predominates.

"2. The *Placetum Regium* is abolished.

"3. The right of the Bishops to communicate with the Papal Chair in spirit-al matters, as also with the clergy and people, and to issue instructions and rdinances in spiritual matters is recognized.

"4. The Bishops alone have the right to appoint their vicars and counselors, o ordain, or to refuse to ordain those priests whom they may consider un-worthy, to found or to divide livings or rectories, to order public prayers, to onvoke synods, to publish pastoral letters and spiritual rescripts, and to pro-ibit dangerous books.

"5. The Bishops are to watch over the religious instruction given to the youth of the country in all public and private schools. All Roman Catholic elementary schools are to be under the direction of a clerical inspector.

"6. The Bishops are to appoint the catechists, and no one will be allowed to teach theology or canonical law without their permission.

"7. Agreeably to the canons or conditions of the Council of Trent (it sat from 1545 to 1563) clerical matters will be settled by clerical judges, and temporal judges will only meddle in matrimonial matters when they relate to the spiritual (should probably be 'temporal') consequences of that sacrament, (marriage.)

"8. The Bishops have the full right to punish the clergy who may offend against the discipline of the Church, and to condemn to punishment those who may offend against the canons of the Church. The civil courts will only have to take cognizance of civil matters and of crimes committed by the clergy, but even then the Bishop must previously receive notice of what is about to be done.

"9. In the prisons the clergy are to be separated from the laymen. The immunities of the churches shall be maintained as long as they do not interfere with the public security.

"10. Disputes with laymen in respect to the right of patronage to be decided by temporal courts.

"11. Oral and written defamation of the Catholic religion, of the holy Liturgy, of Bishops, and of priests, will not be tolerated. (This translation is from the German, but in the *Gazetta di Venezia* the sentence begins, "The Emperor is bound not to tolerate oral or written defamation," &c.)

"12. The opinions of the Bishops of the province will be taken at the presentation of new Bishops to the Papal Chair.

"13. The Bishops alone have rights over the seminaries, (theological,) and it is for them to appoint the rectors, professors, and teachers.

"14. The rectors are to be chosen by concurrence, (*konkurs.*) The principal dignitaries of the chapter are to be nominated by the Papal Chair, when there is no right patronage. The others are to be appointed by the Emperor, excepting when there is a right of patronage, or the Bishops receive permission to fill up the vacant places.

"15. To the Emperor is given the privilege of appointing to all deaneries and rectories, when there is a right of patronage belonging to religious and school property, on condition that his choice shall fall on one of three persons who shall be proposed by the Bishops after a previous regular concurrence, (*konkurs.*)

"16. The Papal Chair, with the consent of the Emperor, has full power to establish new sees, and to make new divisions of those already existing.

"17. His Majesty undertakes to give a sufficient *kongrua* (if the root of the word is *congruere* it must here mean Imperial confirmations) to those rectories which are at present without them.

"18. The property of the Church will be managed according to the directions of the canonical institutions, and in regard to its possession those regulations will be followed which are prescribed by the canons.

"19. The clergy belonging to the monasteries have a right to free communication with their superiors residing at Rome, and the latter have the full right to visit the convents in the empire, and to issue circulars respecting discipline, &c.

"20. The monastic orders have the right to establish noviciates, (institutions for the instruction of persons intending to retire from the world,) and the Bishops, after having come to an understanding with the Government, to establish new monasteries and cloisters.

"21. The property of the Church is declared sacred and inviolable. The Church has also the full right to acquire new property.

"22. No suppression of the property of the Church, and no sale of the same can take place, without the intervention of the Papal Chair. The rights of the Bishops are never to be infringed on.

"23. The property of the Church is to be managed according to the canonical ordinances. A mixed commission will be appointed for the administration of the vacant benefices.

"24. The right to levy tithes to be maintained wherever it exists, and his Majesty pledges himself to give to the Church a good title to claim them wherever it may be wanting.

"25. All other matters which are not mentioned in this Concordat will be managed according to the doctrines of the Church, and the existing arrangements which may be approved by the Papal Chair.

"26. The Concordat is declared to be a State law for ever, and all the laws and agreements which have hitherto been valid in ecclesiastical matters are published throughout the empire."

The ultimate design of this new league between the Pope and Austria, in which the Emperor has conceded rights always held by his predecessors, is of course but conjecture. A clever contemporary theorizes after the following manner:

"Austria has taken refuge in the bosom of the Church against the dangers of revolution. Rome has taken refuge in the bosom of Austria against the dangers threatened by the alliance of France and England.

"The policy of the Western Alliance contemplates the aggrandizement of Sardinia, the humiliation of King Bomba of Naples, and the division of the spiritual and temporal power in the states of the Church. This latter object is known to be a favorite one of Louis Napoleon. For this, if for no other reason, the Pope is peculiarly jealous of the French Emperor, and longs to see French bayonets displaced by Austrian bayonets in the seven-hilled city. Meanwhile, everybody in Rome is involved in doubt and suspense. The people are looking with interest towards England and France. The Pope and the clergy have their faces turned towards Austria."

CHURCH IN CANADA.

The following Dispatch has been received in Canada, from the Secretary of the Colonies. It settles a most important question for the Church, which has now nothing to do but go to work.

Despatch No. 36, from Sir William Molesworth to Sir Edmund Head, is as follows:

"Downing Street,
24th September, 1855.

"Sir:

"With reference to Lord J. Russell's Dispatch of the 4th of May last, acknowledging an address to her Majesty from the Legislative Council and Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, praying for the repeal of such English Statutes as impede the meeting of the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England in Synod, and that the choice of Bishops may be left to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese,

"I now enclose for your information a copy of a letter received from the Law Advisers of the Crown, to whom the subject had been referred by his Lordship.

"You will perceive from the terms of that letter the difficulties which must necessarily impede Her Majesty's Government in dealing with that subject, regarding as it does the rights and position of members of the Church of England not in Canada only, but throughout the colonial possessions of the empire.

"Her Majesty's Government will, however, not fail to take the whole question into their earnest consideration: and, notwithstanding the legal or rather constitutional objections adverted to in the letter which I now transmit, I am myself thoroughly persuaded that the desire for freedom of action and self-government on behalf of the Church of England in Canada, is just and reasonable for the reasons specified in the Address and in your dispatch.

"For the present, however, further delay is unavoidable. And, as it appears

to me that the division of the Diocese of Toronto is so much desired that it may be very inconvenient to postpone it until the general question is disposed of, I have to inform you that Her Majesty's Government are prepared to take the necessary steps for this purpose, whenever required so to do, and that they will recommend to Her Majesty for appointment to the new bishopries such clergymen as you may yourself designate to them after consulting with the bishop and such authorities of the Church of England, in the colony, as you may think advisable and taking such precautions as to the inefficiency of the means for endowing such a bishopric as you may judge necessary.

"You will have the goodness to communicate a copy of this dispatch forthwith on my part to the Bishop of Toronto.

I have, &c.,

(Signed,) WILLIAM MOLESWORTH."

THE BRITISH COLONIAL BISHOPS.

The following return of the number of Colonial Bishops, stating the salaries of each, and sources whence those salaries are derived, has been presented to Parliament:—

Quebec—George Jehoshaphat Mountain, £1,000, Imperial Parliamentary vote.

Toronto—John Strachan, £1,250, Clergy Reserves in Canada West.

Montreal—Francis Fulford, £800, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Nova Scotia—Hibbert Binney, £700, interest of Trust Fund appropriated to the endowment of this see by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Fredericton—John Medley, £1,000, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Newfoundland—Edward Feild, £1,200; £300 Parliamentary vote as Archdeacon of Newfoundland; £200 Parliamentary vote; £200 Colonial Funds as Archdeacon of Bermuda; £500 from Society for the Propagation of the Gospel as Bishop of Newfoundland.

Rupert's Land—David Anderson, £700, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Jamaica—Aubrey George Spencer, £3,000, Consolidated Fund.

Barbadoes—Thomas Parry, £2,500, Consolidated Fund.

Antigua—Daniel Gateward Davis, £2,000, Consolidated Fund.

Guiana—William Piercy Austin, £2,000, Consolidated Fund.

Sydney—Frederic Barker, £1,500, General Colonial Revenue, under Schedu (C) annexed to Act 5 and 6, Vict. c. 76.

Melbourne—Charles Perry, £1,333 6s. 8d.; £1,000 Colonial Treasury; £333 6s. 8d., Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Newcastle—William Tyrrell, £833 6s. 8d.; £500 Colonial Treasury; £333 6s. 8d. Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Adelaide—Augustus Short, £800, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Tasmania—Francis Russell Nixon, £1,250; £1,000 for salary and allowances from Colonial Funds, and the interest of £5,000 granted by the Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

New Zealand—George Augustus Selwyn, £600, Colonial Bishopric's Fund.

Cape Town—Robert Gray, £800, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Colombo—James Chapman, £2,000, Colonial Funds.

Victoria—George Smith, £1,000, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Gibraltar—George Tomlinson, £1,200, Colonial Bishopric's Fund.

Sierra Leone—J. W. Weeks, £400; £500 as Colonial Chaplain, £400 from Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Mauritius—Vincent William Ryan, £850; £600 as Senior Chaplain from Colonial Funds, and the interest of £6,300 granted by Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Graham's Town—John Armstrong, £800 Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Natal—John William Colenso, £800, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

Labuan—Francis T. M'Dougall, £500, Colonial Bishopries' Fund.

THE

CHURCH REVIEW.

OL. IX. OCTOBER, 1856. No. 3.

RT. I.—MARCION: AND HIS RELATION TO ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

Tertulliani Opera. Cur. Gersdorf. Leips. 1841.

Epiphanii Opera. Paris. 1622.

Kritische Untersuchungen, &c. Von Dr. Baur. Tübingen. 1847.

Das Nach Apostolisch. Zeitalter. Von Dr. A. Schwegler. Tübingen. 1846.

Das Evangelium Marcions. Von A. Ritschl. Tübingen. 1846.

Die Evangelien Justins, &c. Von A. Hilgenfeld. Halle. 1850.

Das Markus Evangelium. Von Dr. Baur. Tübingen. 1851.

HE course of modern historic criticism, as it concerns the uineness of the canonical Gospels, has once more brought he notice of men the long-forgotten name of Marcion. Un- within a brief period, the student of Church History l doctrine has been accustomed to consider him simply as of that mass of theosophic dreamers who hung like a cloud ng the horizon of the primitive Church. He has not seem- even as the distinct representative of an idea; nor the em- liment of any special principle. He has been called a

Gnostic—a clever able man, but wholly lost to the issues and interests which concern the modern world.

But a real historical man is not permitted to pass entirely from the thoughts of the world. A person of real significance in any epoch-forming period of the world's history, whether for good or for evil, is sure to find his "own place." His work becomes recognized; his contributions to the general structure of Human History are ultimately and definitely ascertained. The same Law which preserves the memory of the good, preserves the memory of the evil. History has its lights and shadows—the evolutions of the goodness or of the evil of the men who make and shape it. It is a revelation of the μαχε αἰωνος—the everlasting battle of the opposing forces which are ever acting and reacting upon each other in the sphere of religion, of philosophy, of politics, of art, and of social life. Hence to know it, it is necessary to look upon all its sides and phases: to study its darkness as well as its light, to observe the phenomena which are within our reach, to group the agents and active powers of it as they were related to each other, or stood over against each other. In this way each man's work is ascertained, and the past is reproduced in all the truth and freshness of fact. Special interest centers at this moment, in various particulars, in one of the least known—perhaps, in fact, *the* darkest period of Christian History, and which for convenience sake we may name the Sub-Apostolic time. Especially does it interest us, from the fact that many scholars, dissatisfied with the old Catholic view respecting the origin of the Gospels, are endeavoring to find within it, what they profess themselves unable to find elsewhere.

To us there is, in every respect, a great attraction in this age. It brings nothing less to our minds than the early struggling Church of Jesus Christ, starting upon its world-conquering course without the leadership of the great Apostles who then slept in their graves; when it no longer could seek counsel from the chosen organs and instruments of divine revelation; when the δυναμεις and the χαρισματα of the Apostolic age were disappearing and the ordinary historic phenomena of Christianity were just beginning to assume form and shape. We are embosomed within the deep twilight of the morning. Our sources of information are few; we are compelled almost to feel our way. There must have been a feeling of commingled hope and dread in the elder members of the Church, when they considered that not one of the Apostles called personally by the Lord Jesus, was left to them, but that the work of governing and guiding the Body must devolve now and

henceforth upon men who could not speak everywhere with authority. The day of wrath had come, and Jerusalem was a heap of stones. The line of demarcation between Jew and Gentile, between the synagogue and the Church had become stronger and wider. The influence of the Judaizing Christians shrivelled and perished; the Church awoke to the magnitude of her work in the world. Yet how dark to us,

"For knowledge is of things we see."

Dark, we mean, in the process. For how often has the question been asked, what followed immediately upon, or soon after the death of the Apostles?—what followed? And this has been the difficult problem to solve. In the Holy Scriptures we have before us a distinct picture of the Apostolic Age —in the last half of the second century we see the Christianity of an Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, a little later, that of Tertullian and Cyprian, and everywhere marks of a formed Catholic Communion and consciousness. But between the disappearance of the Great Apostles, and the productions of the Fathers just named there is an interval of more than three quarters of a century. It is an interval when suffering was sharp, when distractions were manifold and deep, when monstrous heresies were abundant—yet withal, when *formative power* was strong, and the course of the Gospel glorious. But as its literary monuments are few, and these not of a sort to impart definiteness to our historical knowledge, it has been more exposed to subjective hypothesis and conjecture than any one given period of Church History. Thus all modern sectaries maintain, that profound organic, and even abnormal changes in Church Government were then effected. The Congregationalist informs us that during this period Independency was lost to the Church; the Presbyterian says the same thing of Presbyterianism. The Ana-Baptist assures the world that Pædo-Baptism was introduced in violation of the true meaning of Baptism. In a word, it was then that the Church went into eclipse!

At last now, upon this very ground have the opposing forces of Faith and unbelief gathered to do battle in the matter of the integrity and genuineness of the four Canonical Gospels. This is the battle field now and for this day whither every man must repair who is called to take any part in the contest, or who even seeks to understand it thoroughly. Of course, it is obvious that this ground has not been chosen by Faith. For the Faith of Christendom has no interest in the Sub-Apostolic Age in respect of the origin of the Gospels. It is content to believe that

they were written in the Apostolic Age, by the persons whose names they bear. It pronounces every theory false which would assign to them a later date. Unbelief takes its stand here. It says—the Canonical Gospels were written not by Apostles or by "Apostolical" men, but by Christians who lived after the Apostles, and who made use of the traditions, whether written or oral, which were floating about on the surface of the Church. Finding no comfort in the Apostolic Age, still less in the times of Irenæus, it thus betakes itself to this, where, as we have said, there is more room for conjecture than in any other period of Church History. Amid this twilight it hopes to accomplish what the strong sunshine of well known History forbids it to undertake. It here weaves its hypotheses with an insolent recklessness which betrays its fear and its hate. It has devised a special theory to meet the case of each Gospel, and St. Luke's in particular has been accounted for and constructed by means of the Gospel recognized and used by Marcion. Marcion thus becomes an important witness either for or against the prevailing view of Christendom touching the age and origin of St. Luke's Gospel, and in this respect challenges the thoughtful interest of the Christian scholar.

But in what way is, or can, Marcion's name be connected with the Gospel of St. Luke?—with the question of its age or origin? To comprehend the force of this question, or to be able to answer it, it is necessary to consider who Marcion was, and what he did in the sphere of Christian doctrine; in a word, what his relation was to the Catholic Church of his day. A profound mystery envelopes his early life. We know simply that he was born in Sinope, in Pontus. But the date of his birth is uncertain, nor is it known certainly whether his parents were Christian or heathen. Epiphanius, indeed, asserts (Hares. xlii., p. 300) that his father was a Christian Bishop. Neander, however, has thrown grave suspicion over this tradition from the circumstance that Tertullian in his personal invectives against the unlucky heretic would have turned this fact against him—made it appear as an aggravation of his sin—had he known it. Certainly his silence forms a presumptive argument against the accuracy of the statement of Epiphanius. In fact, Tertullian's language seems to imply that Marcion was a convert from heathenism, for he states that in the first warmth of his faith (primo calore fidei) he had devoted a handsome sum to the service of the Church. Epiphanius, moreover, states that he began life as a Monk, but that having debauched a Virgin, he was excommunicated by his father, who refused to restore him to the communion of the Church, though he

ought it with fervent prayers. Again, Tertullian is silent respecting the personal immorality of Marcion,* and his silence here is more significant, from the fact that he explicitly charges Apelles,† a disciple of his, with incontinence. All things considered, therefore, the statement of Tertullian that Marcion was a member of the Church of Rome under the Episcopate of Eleutherus, in the reign of Antoninus, is to be referred to the account of Epiphanius. It has about it a more decided air of historic probability. What carried Marcion to Rome,‡ we cannot tell. If he had been, as Tertullian alleges, a member of the Roman Church, we must suppose simply that his anti-catholic views were formed by association with heretics in the Imperial City, who were active in the propagation of their theories and vagaries, and that attempting to extend them within the Church he was excommunicated. We believe, therefore, that he was cut off from the Church, because his principles were hostile to hers, and not for any sensuality or overt act of sin.

But what were these principles, so hostile to those of the Church?§ Fortunately here we are no longer in the dark. We can move with a freedom quite satisfactory after the uncertainties in which his personal career is involved. His principle, then, which was irreconcilable with that of the Catholic Church, was this—he believed in a strict Dualism of Deities—in two Gods—a Demiurgus, the Creator of the World, who was the God of the Old Testament, and in a highest God, who was revealed in and through Jesus Christ. This was of course the Gnostic principle, but Marcion differed from the Gnostics in this, that he did not speculate upon or recognize the broods of Aeons and the like, with which they peopled their brains, but he applied his leading idea of the two Deities to the concrete fact of revealed Religion. He believed that the Demiurgus was revealed in the Old Testament; that he was the God

---

* Tertullian's Tract de Præs. Hæret, has a spurious supplement beginning at p. 32. On p. 39 of this performance there is a statement of Marcion's immorality similar to that of Epiphanius. Who wrote it we do not know.

† He names him "*desertor continentiæ Marcionensis.*"—De Præscrip. Hæret, c. 30, p. 21.

‡ Marcion, according to an old legend, met Polycarp in Rome and asked him if he knew him? Certainly, replied the venerable man—*I recognize the first born of Satan.* The Traditions respecting Marcion, are almost touching. He tells us (de præscrip Hæret,) that he sought finally reconciliation with the Church; and that this was promised him, *provided* he would restore to the Church the souls that he had beguiled—but that his death prevented the consummation of his desire.

§ The reader will find a very full and clear statement of Marcion's principles in Baur's Christliche Gnosis, and in Neander's Church History.

of the Jews, not *evil* indeed in Himself, but nevertheless possessed of attributes repugnant to those of the highest God. His distinguishing attribute was Righteousness. He was the Lawgiver, and as such he was contrary to the God of the Gospel. To Marcion, a being under the sway of Righteousness, as his distinguishing characteristic, must necessarily appear harsh, stern and cruel. Man could not love such a being, but must fear and hate him. He must, therefore, necessarily be imperfect. He did not possess that moral goodness, the soul of which is love.

Now the hatred which Marcion conceived against this figment of his brain, he transferred to the Old Testament, to the institutions of Moses, to Psalmist and Prophet. He rejected the Old Economy throughout as an exhibition of the spirit and power of the Demiurgus. The principle which caused him to reject Judaism compelled him likewise to deny that the Heathens had attained to a knowledge of the true God. All that they knew of God was by means of Nature, but nature was the work of the Demiurgus, and could not therefore reveal to them the highest Deity.

It is obvious, then, that Marcion, in the assertion of this principle, placed himself in a posture of hostility over against the Church. For the Church was committed to the identity of the God of the Old Covenant, with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The bitter feud between Judaizing and Gentile Christians had, in the main, subsided. St. Paul's principles had triumphed, and, with the Apostle to the Gentiles, the Church understood the Law to be our Schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. Its Christ, therefore, could not be the Christ of Marcion; for it held, *de fide*, that Christ was born of a woman, born under the Law. Consequently, in this the work and power of what Marcion deemed the Demiurgus were visible. But Marcion, to get rid of the difficulty, justifies fully Tertullian's accusation, that he was *Caucaso abruptior*. He denied that Christ was born at all, refused in any way to account for Him, accepted Him as an abrupt fact. His body was the mere appearance of a body—caro nec caro, homo nec homo, says Tertullian. Thus Marcion's Christ was not the Son of God in the flesh, but a passing phenomenon, a visible shape, an audible voice proclaiming and revealing the highest God.

Let it be borne in mind that this with Marcion was not a dream, not a mere speculation, but a practical concern to the recognition of which he proposed to bring the Church, and for the sake of which he was willing to suffer. In so far, therefore, as it was with him a practical interest, it must assume,

upon his part, a reformatory movement. Fully conscious of the radical difference between his own stand-point and that of the Church, he explained the difference on the ground that the Church had lost, or at least had seriously corrupted the true faith. The question would naturally occur, how, by what means could the faith be restored to its purity? A serious question for Marcion. For he did not view himself as the original, the first called minister or representative of Christ. True Christianity had had its inspired teacher and Apostle. He was simply reformer, not originator. In the language of Tertullian, he aimed to be an *emendator evangelii*. Where could he find this true Apostle but in him who had announced himself as the Apostle to the Gentiles, who had proclaimed that man is justified by faith, without the works of the law, who had spoken of the law as a thing which had passed away, and was no longer of any force or authority? He turned, therefore, to the Apostle Paul, viewed himself as his follower, and upon the authority of his teaching hoped to effect his purpose of restoring the faith to its original beauty and simplicity.

Behold Marcion, then, about the middle of the second century, with his *Canon of Holy Writ*,* framed upon a foregone conclusion, and *consisting of ten of St. Paul's epistles and one gospel*, which has usually been considered to be that of St. Luke. He rejected the writings of the Apostles of the circumcision, because in his judgment they were the servants of the Demiurgus, and were ignorant of the highest God. A foregone conclusion, we observe, directed the formation of Marcion's Canon. Here then we are brought to the historical-critical question in which we have a present interest. Did he use one of our Canonical Gospels, or did he not? Let us state the question.

From the time of Irenæus, all along the course of Church history, down to the last quarter of the eighteenth century, it was believed, without contradiction, that Marcion took our canonical St. Luke, and adapted it to subserve the purposes of his ultra anti-Jewish, Gnostic stand-point. This was the undoubted traditional view of Christendom. Its truthfulness was questioned for the first time by Semler,† in his Notes to a Translation of R. Simon's Critical History of the New Testament.

* The following were the Epistles received by Marcion, and in this order: I. Galatians; II. 1 Corinthians; III. 2 Corinthians; IV. Romans; V. 1 Thessalonians; VI. 2 Thessalonians; VII. Ephesians; [Marcion called this the Epistle to the Laodiceans, whereupon Tertullian growls—"Quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator;"] VIII. Colossians; IX. Philippians; X. Philemon (see Tertullian Adv. Mar., bb. 5, and Epiph. Op. Hæres. XLII., pp. 318 322 Gospel: *St. Luke*.

† Ritschl. Evangel. Marcions, p. 7.

... these the
... St. Luke
... Semler
... in Ger-
... made
... lars,
... far
... Luke's gos-
... was,
... Fathers al-
... any
... which
... 's argu-
... the effect
... re of

... it up
... Luke's gospel
... They
... ears of
... their
... of St.
... way says,
... use of Mar-
... ted
... Hall and Ol-
... Do
... We shall
... again.
... way of ex-
... S. Wetzer, and
... What the ar-
... and in what
... of a con-
... the subject re-
... rather sufficient
... to enter upon
... appears that
... Fathers, especially of
... tion, and more
... posed. A new ver-

... y shallow upon this sub-
... lars.

sion of an Old Chapter of Church and of "Gospel" History is submitted to the judgment of the scholars of Christendom.

The question naturally presents itself, have any new sources of information been discovered? Has an authentic contemporary history, after having, as some Pompeii or Nineveh, lain buried for ages, been brought to the light of day, which forever henceforth must dispose of this subject contrary to all past judgments upon it? Nothing of the sort. We are all as dependent now upon Tertullian and Epiphanius as the world was when Semler first questioned the truth of their charges against Marcion. To these Fathers then we must go, and weigh their reasonings and accusations, and judge whether they give a right report or not. Especially to them, because Irenæus contents himself with noticing briefly what they dwelt upon at length. Tertullian's work against Marcion is a remarkable production. It is a fierce whirlwind of invective and passion, sweeping over the entire field of Marcionism, yet it is nevertheless a masterpiece of attack. The violence of its personal abuse is indeed the last thing which a modern theologian should either copy or admire, but the power of its argumentation, and the skill with which it is managed, have rarely been surpassed in polemical theology. Everywhere it is charged with a swarthy, fiery glow of thought and expression. It displays, too, a patient industry which never flags. Not content with his onslaught upon the speculative principles of Marcion, Tertullian pursues him into nooks and corners, dwells elaborately upon details, discusses verses and fragments of verses in "his gospel," and thus enables us to form a tolerably clear judgment of the omissions in it, and of the particulars wherein it differs from our third canonical gospel.

Obviously it is necessary to study with care the fourth book of Tertullian against Marcion, if we wish to form an intelligent notion of the matter now in hand. He opens his subject by a reference to the *antitheses* of Marcion, so named because it is an attempt to establish a separation between the Law and the Gospel, grounded on their mutual contrarieties.* After a brief reference to this performance, he turns to the "Pontic Gospel." He refers, in passing, to the well-known received view of the Church touching the authorship of the "evangelicum instru-

* Antitheses cognominatum et ad separationem legis et Evangelii coactum, adv. Marcionem, Lib. IV, C. 1, p. 145. The references to Tertullian are from the edition of Gersdorf by Tauchnitz, Leipsic, 1841. To Epiphanius, from the Paris edition of 1622.

[illegible] that it was written by [illegible] by the latter. Mark and [illegible] state, though they may [illegible] nevertheless agree *de re*. [illegible] Marcion's gospel does [illegible] *supplementum* in the [illegible] Christ's real humanity [illegible] with the relation of the [illegible] murder, did not bear [illegible] the commentators [illegible] Luke, whom he [illegible] why he had chosen St. [illegible] by the reader [illegible] question. It was [illegible] "separator" of the Apostles. Marcion recognized [illegible] seen the Twelve, because [illegible] obtained, by a false [illegible] Galatians, that Paul [illegible] Tertullian takes care [illegible] Paul's reproof of Peter,§ [illegible] the variare convictum,) [illegible] prohibited by all the Apostles, [illegible] remembrance the [illegible] James, John and [illegible] fellowship. If, then, [illegible] Apostles was corrupted, [illegible] same unfortunate [illegible] beneath such a deluge— [illegible] —it must of [illegible] the rest of the world.

[illegible] has the gospel. "I [illegible] that the gospel [illegible] We shall determine be- [illegible] the elder, and [illegible] more recent [illegible] true, so of ne-

---

* [illegible]

† [illegible] Lucan videtur, ne [illegible] Curious re- [illegible] My neighbor [illegible]

§ [illegible] The Tübingen critics prefer Marcion's view of this chapter to the orthodox.

cessity, must the true exist before the false."* Tertullian plants himself here with great emphasis. To him it was absurd to suppose that the older forms of the gospel could be corrupt, and the newer the pure Truth. The position of Marcion carried with it a manifest contradiction. He maintained that the gospel current in the Church was falsified, and he was its "*emendator*."† It was falsified and interpolated, inasmuch as it stood consentient with the Law and the Prophets.‡ Now, his emendations established the antiquity, the priority of the thing amended. This very priority, however, was the refutation of the Marcionite position. "In fine," he adds, "if that be truer which is the older, that the older, which was from the beginning, that from the beginning, which was from the Apostles, equally, beyond all contradiction, shall it be certain that that has been delivered by the Apostles, which has been deemed inviolate (sacrosanct) among the Churches of the Apostles. Let us see what sort of milk (quod lac) the Corinthians drew from the Apostle; according to what rule the Galatians were reproved; what the Philipians, the Thessalonians, the Ephesians, read; what, likewise, the Romans, from our neighborhood, sound forth; to whom the Apostles, Peter and Paul, bequeathed a gospel, sealed by their blood. We have also the foster churches of John. For, although Marcion rejects his Apocalypse, the order of Bishops considered with respect to its origin, stands upon John as its author.§ I say, therefore, that among the Churches, not simply of apostolical origin, but everywhere, the gospel of Luke, which we defend, has stood accredited from the date of its publication; but Marcion's gospel is not known to most of them, *nor is it known by any without being condemned.*" Marcion's churches recognize it indeed, but they are as adulterated as his gospel. "Wasps

* Ego meum dico verum, Marcion suum, Ego Marcionis affirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit nisi temporis ratio, ei præscribens auctoritatem, quod antiquius reperietur, et ei praejudicans vitiationem quod posterius revincetur? In quantum enim falsum corruptio est veri, in tantum præcedat necesse est veritas falsum. Tertullian, Bk. 4, C. 4, p. 150.

† Interpolatum a protectoribus Judaismi ad concorporationem legis et prophetarum. Ibid.

‡ Tertullian's Latin is notoriously difficult, and his style is obscure; nevertheless there is no reason why we should "raise a point," as some recent writers have done, respecting his use of the word Evangelium. Sometimes it means *the Gospel*, as we use the word, to denote Christianity, and sometimes a written document, as we again use it when speaking of the Gospel, or Gospels. The context almost invariably relieves one from any difficulty upon this score. Marcion aimed to be an *Emendator Evangelii* in two respects—of Christianity as such, and of one of its written Gospels.

§ Tertullian, p. 151. "Ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus in Joannem stabit auctorem." Tertullian is not the only person who has said this.

make nests, and so also do the Marcionites make Churches." (Faciunt favos et vespae etc.)

We call the attention of the reader to Tertullian's line of thought here, because use has been, and must continue to be, made of it in the consideration of the subject in general. He expressly declares that Marcion's gospel lacks the "patrocinium antecessorum"—that wheresoever it was known among the Churches in Catholic communion it was condemned. For it was a different thing from the Church's gospel, different, yet like it. It was like it, because it was altered from St. Luke to suit his own views and ends. After this introduction he applies himself with a definite dogmatic purpose to the Text, *which* and *as* Marcion used it. He states this purpose explicitly; he develops his line of argument so completely as to free the reader from all uncertainty or doubt. He seizes upon the salient points of Marcion's theory, the key-note of his system, with a view to a tremendous, overwhelming assault. He dashes at his opponent in a style which brings to one's mind the Numidian Cavalry at Cannae.

"For assuredly every thing he has elaborated, even in preparing the antitheses, he drives to this one point, that he may establish diversity between the Old Testament and the New, with the view to separate his Christ from the Creator, as the Christ of some other God, as alien to the Law and the Prophets. On this account, indeed, he has erased things which, agreeing with the Creator, are at war with his own idea. He has erased them, as if they were thrust into the Text by His advocates, but has retained the portions which are compatible with his own opinions. These we shall bring together and discuss, to ascertain whether they are rather with us, whether they brand the presumption of Marcion. Then it will appear that the portions erased are manifestly under the same defect of heretical blindness as those also which he has retained. So then the scope and form of our little work will hold us in every respect under that limit or condition which is recognized by both parties. The principle of Marcion is, that the Christ who, in the times of Tiberius, was revealed by a God, hitherto unknown, for the salvation of all men, was one, and that the Christ who, when he shall come, is designed by God the Creator for the restitution of the Jewish Commonwealth, is another. Between these two he runs a distinction, great and complete. It is a distinction with him between just and good, between Law and Gospel, between Judaism and Christianity. Hence also our praescript, under which we lay down the principle that there should be nothing common to the Christ of the other God with the Creator, but, on the other hand, He is to be pronounced the Christ of the Creator, if He shall have administered His ordinances, have fulfilled His prophecies, aided His laws, represented His promises, restored His virtues, if He have reformed opinions and morals, if He have set forth His Sovereignty. I beg thee, reader, to bear in mind this agreement, and this mode of treating my subject, and undertake now to decide whether Christ be Marcion's or the Creator's."*

---

* Certe enim totum, quod elaboravit etiam antitheses praestruendo, in hoc cogit, ut veteris et novi testamenti diversitatem constituat, proinde Christum suum a Creatore separaturus ut dei alterius, ut alienum legis et prophetarum. Certe propterea contraria quaeque sententiae suae erasit, conspirantia cum Crea-

ter this statement of his object, he proceeds forthwith to ork, and adheres with admirable strictness to his line of ment. He shows at full length and in elaborate detail, by on from the Old Testament and by argumentation, that the st of Marcion's own admitted gospel was not after all such ng as he had fancied—not the Christ, in fact, in whom he ved. He was on the contrary a Being who in His own n fulfilled the law and the prophets, who lived and taught in the pale of the law, who was, in a word, the Christ pro- d by the God of the Old Testament—a proposition or arti- f faith in full hostility over against the Marcionite idea. leeds of Christ and the sayings of Christ are shown to be in harmony with the voice of Old Testament prophecy. ave here, in fact, the earliest attempt upon a large scale lustrate the Gospel by the Jewish Scriptures. And so llian rings the changes upon the fact, that Marcion's text, ithstanding his alterations and erasures, really sets forth hrist of the Catholic Church. He shows the flesh-and- l line and color in Marcion's text, though he had sought so ully to blot them out. His docetic fiction could not stand st of his own gospel. Christ appears in it, in spite of all s, "as the end of the law for righteousness," Tertullian at exclaiming, "Frustra laborasti, Christus enim Jesus in gelio tuo meus est." (p. 254.)

ir subject does not require us to follow him. It has been ssary simply to understand his point of view and his me- ; to see clearly what his argumentation is. The reader have noticed that to carry out his purpose, it was neces- for Tertullian to confine himself to Marcion's Text. He ot, for that would have been foreign to the end he had in

---

quasi ab adsertoribus ejus intexta: competentia autem sententiæ suæ res- t. Hæc conveniemus hæc amplectemur, si nobiscum magis fuerint, si nis præsumptionem percusserint. Tunc et illa constabit eodem vitio es cæcitatis erasa, quae et hæc reservata. Sic habebit intentio et forma ali nostri, sub illa utique conditione, quæ ex utraque parte condicta sit. tuit Marcion alium esse Christum qui Tiberianis temporibus a deo quon- quoto revelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium: alium, qui a deo Creatore itutionem Judaici status sit destinatus quandoque venturus. Inter hos m et omnem differentiam scindit, quantum inter justum (he does not say ı) et bonum, quantum inter legem et evangelium, quantum inter Judaism- Christianismum. Hinc erit et nostra præscriptio, qua defigimus, nihil o Dei alterius commun eesse debere cum Creatore, ceterum Creatoris pro- ndum, si administraverit dispositiones ejus, si impleverit prophetias ejus, verit leges ejus, si representaverit promissiones ejus, si restauraverit vir- jus, si sententias reformaverit, si mores, si proprietates expresserit. Hujus st hujus præscripti, quæso te lector, memineris ubique et incipe recognos- nt Marcionis Christum aut Creatoris."—Adv. Mar., p. 152.

...ce he had *erased*,
...ld he exor-
...although you
...nevertheless re-
...throw your own
...*identity* of Mar-
...point is brought to
...for the most part
...as the order of the
...with the manipula-
...as far as it goes (and it
...proceed to the ques-

...? How can we, if
...explicitly the particulars
...any clear satisfactory
...sustain the accuracy of his
...assail it? It is cer-
...we are in the dark or
...Text has been at-
...need be at no loss re-
...variations and alterations—the
...St. Luke. We ascer-
...in the main by a ready pro-
...the essential interests of
...Marcion. Tertullian
...contained in St. Luke.
...was first attempted in a
...securities, were supposed
...sections in Marcion's Text.
...Epiphanius acquired certi-
...experience has proved
...are not, either from their
...enough to justify a scep-
...Epiphanius of course,
...heresies. Marcion naturally at-
...Tertullian he turns against him, in
...passages in his own gospel, but unlike
...experience, he furnishes a list of
...altered, and states sometimes ex-
...generally, the extent and character
...omissions and erasures. This list is not complete, nevertheless by the aid of it and upon comparison with Tertullian, not only is a general correspondence found, but in nice

:ulars even scholars are satisfied that they have restored ion's Text.* The credit of paving the way for this critical : is conceded universally to Hahn, who with signal success ded the old view against the followers of Eichhorn. We subjoin Hilgenfeld's Table, made after a fresh examina- pon the basis both of Hahn and of Ritschl:

joined with; 4:31, made the beginning.
, the word Ναζαρηνε (of Nazareth) was wanting.
, After this followed 4:16–30, with significant omissions; va. 16 was g; so also v. 17–21, at least so far as Isa. 61:1–2 is concerned; va. 22, s not Joseph's son?" 23, "in thy country;" 24, entirely wanting; 27, bly.)
, Marcion read ὑμιν instead of αυτοις; 39, wanting.
', εν αυτοις instead of μετ δότων; 23, ὑμιν instead of αὐτων (?).
, wanting; 21, inserted τις μου, &c.—who are my mother and my m?
, M. perhaps read here ραβδον.
1, in this va. he omitted the words *O Father . . . . and earth.*
2, he used the aorist εγνω—knew or has known, &c., and inverted it -no one has known who the Father is except the Son, &c.
5, the word αιωνιον—eternal, was wanting.
, Peculiar reading, "Let thy Spirit descend upon us," instead of "Hal- be thy name."
9–32, from "except the sign of Jonas the prophet" to "a greater than was here," were wanting.
2, "calling" instead of "judgment."
9–51, wanting.
(7?), wanting
, 9, he read "before the face of God," instead of "the angels of God."
8, wanting according to Epiphanius, but not according to Tert.
2, ὑμων (your) wanting.
8, M. read "in the evening (ἑσπερινη) watch, instead of in the second and in the third watch.
–5, wanting.
8, M. read, when ye shall see *all the just*, &c., instead of "*Abraham and nd Jacob, and all the prophets*," &c.
9–35, wanting.
6, "forsake," instead of "hate."
0, "before God," instead of "before the Angels of God."
.1–32, wanting. (The Parable of the prodigal son.)
.7, "my words" instead of "the Law."
, "It were better for him had he not been born," interpolated.
.0, wanting.
.4, Probably thus: "and seeing, he said unto them, there were many in the days of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was healed except n the Syrian (4:37), go, &c.
.9, Call me not good; there is one good—God the Father. Tertullian ise.

---

e list of Epiphanius—Haeres, xlii, p. 312, 317.
atique—5:14. 6:16. 11:42. 12:38.
sions—8:19. 10:21 (see below.) 11:30 et seq, ref. to Jonas: 11:49. :38: 13:1–9 (Hil. questions this, and reads 1–5). 13:28. 13:30. 15: -32. 17:10. 18:31. 19:29. 20:37; 21:18. 21:21. 22:16. 22:35. :50; 23:43; 24:25 and 31 (in part.)
polated phrases and words—17:12. 18:18. 23:2.

18: 31–34, wanting.
18: 37, Ὁ Ναζωραιος (the Nazarene) wanting.
19: 9, "inasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham," probably wanting.
19: 29–48, wanting.
20: 9-18, wholly wanting. 19, wanting.
20: 35, after the words "counted worthy," he read "by God."
20: 37–38, wanting.
21: 18, and 21–22, wanting.
22: 16, (17, 18?), wanting; also 30; also 35–38, and 49–51.
23: 2, after "perverting the nation," M. read and "*destroying the Law and the Prophets. . . . * turning the women and children upside down.*"
23: 34, The last half wanting, according to Tertullian, but not to Epiphanius.
23: 43, wanting.
24: 25, "he spake," &c., instead of "the Prophets."
24: 27, wanting entirely; 32, wanting from "while He opened," &c.
24: 44, 45, wanting, or at least much abbreviated.

This list is the result of a nice, fastidious examination—subject perhaps to some, but certainly to no considerable exceptions or corrections. It appears, therefore,

1. That a few of the variations are slight, coming almost under the head of mere readings,—E. g; 10: 4 (?); 12: 38. "*Evening*," instead of *second* and *third*; 14: 26 (? again). 17: 2, if he had not been born.

2. There is another variation scarcely to be accounted for on the ground of omission in the interest of Marcion's system. we mean 13: 1–5. But if this omission extend to vs. 9, and certainly Tertullian's silence authorizes the supposition—though there is some obscurity in Epiphanius—we can thus find a motive for its erasure. 23: 34 is likewise doubtful. 11: 12 and one or two others in the above table.

3. But *the rest* afford decidedly, reasons for their absence from the text of Marcion. And over against these what are the indifferent places? Let the reader judge for himself; we declare them miserably insufficient for the purpose of a counter theory to the charge that Marcion mutilated St. Luke. At the best they suggest that among the MSS. in the second century there were such variations to be accounted for.

Such are the facts of the case. Let us consider them well. We find Marcion with a gospel for the most part identical with our St. Luke, yet not containing places which for him would prove obviously a stumbling block and an offense. The differences between the two were explained originally in one way, and no other explanation can be warranted. For they are manifestly the result of a given tendency; were made in the interests of a speculative principle. They concern chiefly the Lord's humanity, His relation to God the Creator, and the rela-

*In the only copy of Epiphanius within our reach at present the reading is ανασπρεφοντα, Hilgenfeld reads αναστρεφοντα.

of the Gospel to the Law. In all these particulars we know Marcion's view was, and in this gospel of his, purged of ese ingredients so distasteful to him, we can recognize his work in the way in which the Fathers understood and ged it upon him and his followers. The case it seems to nnot fairly admit of a doubt.

it we meet a decided no! In spite of all the evidence, notstanding the strong light in which the matter is placed, re told that Marcion did not even use our St. Luke, much nutilate it. Schwegler, Ritschl and Baur, with their felaborers, have, within the last ten years, gravely informed rorld that they cannot accept the statements of Tertullian of Epiphanius because they furnish no historic proof of bjective truth of the charges brought against Marcion. maintain severally, that from the dogmatic stand-point Fathers, nothing can be gathered to satisfy the historical that our St. Luke is older than the gospel of Marcion. is mean anything, it means that Tertullian is not a comit witness in the premises, because he did not investigate bject after the methods and in the style of the new Tün critics. The proof is not historic, they claim. Let us We confess we find nowhere in Tertullian any theory e *formation* of the Gospels; we find no attempts in the of criticism, at the resolution of St. Luke's Gospel into its ary elements, with a view to its reconstruction. Nothing at sort is here. We do not look for it any more than for eological and chemical methods of modern times. To find with Tertullian, because he did not approach his subject e method of a nineteenth century school, is to find fault all antiquity; and to pronounce him an incompetent ss upon that ground, is to pronounce the entire ancient l at fault! It is to proclaim in effect that it was unable to credible testimony in a matter that belonged to its own

For it may be said in all confidence that Tertullian dis- no idiosyncracies in his method. He treats his subject y other writer of his time would have done, who had such rge to make, such an error to brand. Why should he att to prove that Marcion had altered St. Luke? Did any one ion it? Did it take the world by surprise as a new thing? akes indeed a noble appeal to the "*ratio* temporis," to the rocinium antecessorum." He stands upon the fact that St. 's gospel as the Church then received it, had been so received the date of its publication, but that Marcion's gospel was nown by the majority, and moreover that it was condemnheresoever known. Surely so far as the laws of historic

mony that St. Luke's Gospel was everywhere received and Mar-

ion's rejected: we have satisfactory evidence that Marcion's ext was identical with St Luke's, except in certain particulars hich conflicted with his own ideas: we have evidence that arcion was charged with mutilating St. Luke by the earliest riters who had occasion to notice the matter at all, and there on the other side no rebutting evidence, as the lawyers term

Such testimony, borne out as it is by full documentary mains of the early Christian writers, must, from the nature of e case, be decisive. The lameness of Baur in this respect, who really an able man, (pronounced by the Westminster Review be probably the ablest critic now living,) only shows how nsible men can, in the support of favorite theories, be rawn into weaknesses and absurdities. "Irenæus and Tertulan," he observes, "from whose writings we gather our first quaintance of the Marcionite gospel, lived and wrote in time when the Canonical Luke's gospel had met with a gene-l reception. It had, as it appears, been received without ruple, since the substance of the additions which were made the original text, could afford no ground for its rejection. e do not know, however, in what way it first became circuted, nor how it gradually crowded out the one hitherto curent, and can only maintain that in the time of Irenæus and ertullian it was known by Marcion, and that he availed himelf of it."* What a prodigious demand upon a reader's credu-ity. For that is to say, Marcion did not use our canonical St. uke, but some original gospel, which had once been current the Church, although to be sure we have no evidence that uch a gospel in particular was in existence, although we do ot know how it ceased to be in use—nevertheless this we must elieve. The evidence does not run in the right line; we ust question and refuse it. Now, why did not the Marcionites eet Tertullian with the answer which Dr. Baur and his friends ould have made, had they lived in the second or third century? hy was not the ratio temporis so decisive in Tertullian's dgment turned against him, and employed to his utter dis-omfiture? Why were not the Catholic Fathers told, we have *n older Text* than yours? They claimed that theirs was the ure Gospel freed from Judaizing interpolations and addi-ons; why did they not charge home upon their adversaries, at the *Evangelicum instrumentum* they recognized, was like-ise older and purer than their own? No! This was not in eir power; nevertheless Tertullian is not to be believed, al-

* Baur. Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 424.

though no man apparently but Marcion in the middle of the second century, was acquainted with the original Gospel of which our St. Luke is a "revised edition" with sundry improvements. He is not to be believed because it is easier to accept the notion that Marcion used an "obsolete" Gospel, of which no man had ever heard, than that he should have mutilated the St. Luke current in the Catholic Church, the identity of the phraseology on the one hand, and the character of the variations on the other, in the meantime going for nothing. There is a singular absurdity in the Tübingen position, so far as the mere historical side of the question is concerned.

But then the Tübingen critics are not lost to all the proprieties of a genuine scholarly habit: they do not dismiss with a contemptuous shrug of the shoulders the testimony of the early Church respecting a fact. They wish therefore to show the world why Tertullian is no competent witness in the matter. They do not say anything which in the remotest degree can be construed into a suspicion of the truthfulness of the Fathers, but only, as Dr. Baur expresses it, "they did not understand the true historical relation of both forms of the Gospel to each other." That is, Tertullian did not know that Marcion made no use of St. Luke's Text at all, and from the similitude of the two texts, was led, upon dogmatic grounds, to infer that he had mutilated it; and the rest were within the same category. In the absence now of all *external* data to support the theory that the Fathers were mistaken in this simple matter of fact, recourse is had to an inner criticism of the Text itself. This it is triumphantly said utterly destroys the theory of a corrupted St. Luke.

An inner criticism of the Text is well. It may, however, or it may not subserve the interests of historic truth. Everything here depends upon the spirit in which it is conducted. A document viewed through the medium of one's own prejudices, or for the sake of a theory, ceases to be itself. It is something quite different from what its author intended it. It may be viewed as the critic's not as the author's performance. The Bible, as seen through the atmosphere of a thousand conflicting modern systems, can scarcely be said to be the Bible. An inner criticism of a text therefore, to solve a disputed point must be suspiciously received, unless indeed the method of the critic be rigorously scientific, and pursued with unfaltering fidelity to the admitted principles of research, unbiassed by the power and pressure of subjective hypothesis. This preliminary applies with peculiar force, moreover, to any case like the one now in hand, where between two treatises identical for the most

part in the order of the narration and in the phraseology, the one however not containing passages found in the other, judgment is to be pronounced respecting the relation of the shorter document to the longer, where still further we know of the existence of the shorter document only through the writings of certain persons who testify that it is a mutilation of the longer. We reject therefore peremptorily and in advance, all inventions, all hypotheses. We can deal only in admitted facts, deeming it alike dangerous and unwise to reject the consistent and persistent declarations of an Irenæus, Tertullian and Epiphanius for the sake of vague conjectures. Let us consider, then, in how far the demands of an objective criticism are complied with by the new critics; the reader will learn, we submit, some curious noteworthy facts.

In the first place, then, we are told by Schwegler, who was the first to revise the exploded rationalistic conjecture to which we have already referred,—and who, in fact, may be said to have done scarcely anything more than to reassert the views of Eichhorn, that Marcion could not have mutilated St. Luke upon dogmatic grounds, because the Text as he used it really contained much that was at war with his own system, and we can scarcely suppose that he would have performed his work of mutilation in such a bungling half-way style. With the logical consistency of Marcion in the abstract we have no concern. We know that he did upon dogmatic grounds reject the Catholic view of the Being of Christ, and of the relation of the Law to the Gospel. We know still further that his text contained passages hostile to his own system. It is our business therefore not to rationalize upon the a priori improbability of this thing or the other thing, but to account for the fact in question. How does it happen that anything was reserved by Marcion which really conflicted with his own idea? If this can be explained at all in a satisfactory way, the objection of Schwegler is despoiled of its force. For reasons best known to himself Marcion had a *written Gospel.* But as no satisfactory docetic-gnostic gospel was in existence, he was forced either to write one for his own use or to accept some one already current. He did not venture to write one, he therefore served himself with one. Now had he stricken out everything in it at variance with his own notions, he would have had the merest fragment of a gospel—in fact, a disjointed collection of aphorisms, a record of the Lord's sayings and doings without order or arrangement. The truth of this assertion is obvious. The only course open to him then was to make such use of a gospel as he could without destroying the connection of its parts, and by *a forced interpretation* adapt

many things which in their plain obvious meaning were against him, and as far as possible by this process impart to them a different tone and color. Schwegler himself admits that Marcion availed himself of forced interpretations:* De Wette in his Introduction asserts it without qualification;† and Hahn based an elaborate argument upon it for the overthrow of the older rationalistic position. Here then we have an important fact conceded upon the one hand, and pressed upon the other to substantiate the "corruption theory." For it is maintained with great emphasis and effect, that while Marcion could apply a forced artificial interpretation to some passages, he could not to all; and those which are not found in his Text are the places above all others where from the nature of the case his art would fail him. In vain are efforts made to turn the point of this assertion. In vain does Schwegler himself attempt by special pleading to show that Marcion's text contained passages *as strong* against his own system as those he is accused of having stricken out. Yet in the Texts he adduces in support of this opinion he finds it convenient to pass in silence the first three chapters of St. Luke, and gives us nothing respecting the first verse of Marcion—altogether one of the most decisive features in the entire controversy. Let us examine his argument in the light of some of his examples. His *first Text*‡ is St. Luke vii, 29-35,—omitted by Marcion. Schwegler tells us that the parallel, equal in weight to this, is to be found in C. v, 29-35. But we reply simply that it is not. For in the part omitted, the Lord says—"*The Son of Man is come eating and drinking,*" &c.—in the Text retained, the reference is to the disciples, and the *presence* merely of Jesus at the feast of Levi is mentioned; but no declaration is here that He was eating and drinking. Schwegler's *second example* is equally unfortunate. Marcion omitted 8:19—"his mother and his brethren"—but retained 8:20—"thy mother and thy brethren." The reason is obvious. He distinguishes between the words of the Evangelist and the words of the people. We pronounce these at least utterly impertinent. Nor do we find any motive to

---

* "Weiter ist allerdings richtig dass er sich vielfach mit gezwungenen Erklärungen behalf, und diejenigen stellen, die er mit seiner Theologie oder Christologie nicht vereinigen konnte, auf den Christus des Weltschöpfers oder den Demiurg bezog." Nachapostol, Zeital, p. 271.

† De Wette Ein. 4th Edition, p. 112—cites the following from Tertullian in proof of the assertion—c. 9—on Luke 5:12-16, c. 15; on Luke 6:23, c. 23; 9:28-36, c. 43: 24:39.

‡ Schwegler, N. Z. 1, p. 263 et seq.

s the rest. No special examination of them is needed.* rouping fails to throw light upon the subject or to give gth to his cause. We can stand with unshaken firmness the answer made to the objection that Marcion's text con- l passages against his system—which is, that what he could y a forced interpretation he retained, what he could not, ruck out. It is, we affirm, a bona fide answer, fully sus- l by the facts now before our readers. It is moreover an ar once for all, and we believe that an overwhelming ma- of scholars interested in this subject are now satisfied it.

t we must notice another phase of our critic's position. taining as he does that Marcion did not mutilate St. Luke, els himself called upon to account in some way for Mar- Text. If it were not St. Luke "altered and abridged," was it? And here his flippancy and *insouciance* are conspicuous. He informs us that he believes it to have a gospel current within the circle of the Pauline churches, onfesses that he has no external proofs of the fact, nothing a way of definite testimony, upon which he can rest. But lifficulty is easily surmounted, by the counter retort that idence is at hand to support the opinion that our St. Luke's ler than Marcion's Text! Just as if, to name nothing else, nanimous charge and belief of the Primitive Church, re- ing the relation of the two documents to each other, were refutation of the assertion.

tschl, another "Tübingen critic," in a special Monograph† rtook to prove what Schwegler had suggested as probable, Marcion's gospel was not only older than St. Luke, but was sis, its original in fact; the latter, as we have it, having been ared by some unknown person in the Catholic interest of the d century, in a spirit of conciliation between the Pauline Petrine Christians. He finds it easier to believe that the ca- al Text has received additions than that it suffered erasures e hand of Marcion. He attempts to show that the connec- f the narrative, &c., is better in Marcion than in St. Luke, thus seeks to overturn the "corruption theory," and to esta-

---

* the reader is curious in the matter, let him examine the places next in 10: 25 the word αἰωνιον is omitted, but retained 18: 18—a nice rather weighty instance. Yet as Hilgenfeld says, in the *latter case*, 18: 18, M. find support for his own theory in vs. 22—where the fulfillment of the in its ordinary sense, is shown to be insufficient to obain eternal life. sin—(the next instance)—11: 29 was omitted. The parallel according to 1: 3. But this is the Lord's argumentum ad hominem, as M. would regard t is useless to name others.

† Evangelium Marcionis. Tübingen, 1846.

blish his own. But such subjective hypothesis, such reckless conjecture, requires and admits of no answer. For who shall decide between the two documents, who can, in this way? We deem it absurd to undertake any discussion from which Testimony and objective Law are thus summarily excluded. We mention it simply as a curious phenomenon, as the application of an hypothesis to get rid of one solution of a fact and to thrust another vi et armis into its place. A man may display acuteness in such a little bit of pleasantry, but he must excuse us if we value his efforts less highly than himself. Lastly comes Baur* with high judicial tone accepting alike the notions and arguments of Schwegler and Ritschl, so far as the general question is concerned, avowing that upon the whole each respectively has made good his position, and declaring that henceforth the charge that Marcion really altered St. Luke must be viewed as one of the fictions of a past age. He treats the matter as if it were settled for all time. He contents himself with a general survey of the subject and a repetition of their argument—all with dignified composure, attributing the error of Tertullian and of the Fathers generally, to their ignorance of a true critical method.

And here we might leave the matter with a single comment only upon the fact, that the new critics have not been able to produce anything against the old theory which has not been answered before, except indeed their subjective conjectures which need no notice, because of their own radical, constitutional defect. We must, however, at the risk of wearying his patience, beg the reader to follow us a little farther in this History—in fact to its catastrophe. This will justify the estimate just made of the conjectures of our critics. In the year 1850, Adolf Hilgenfeld, a rising scholar, who is frequently without qualification—as he himself complains—classed among the "Tübingen critics," published a work entitled "*Justin's Gospels, the Clementine Homilies and Marcion's Gospel.*"† It exhibits thorough learning, genuine German patience and industry. To come to our point, it pronounces against the Tübingen critique, and avows that Marcion must have altered the Gospel in the interests of his own system. Hilgenfeld takes great pains to inform his readers that no deference to any external authority has moulded his views, or shaped his conclusions, but that nevertheless the Fathers were right in the main, in their charges against Marcion. He reaches this conclusion likewise by "an inner criticism of the Text." He asserts that Marcion aimed

* Kritische Untersuchungen, &c. Tübingen. † Halle, 1850.

be a more literal interpreter than either the Catholics or
retics of his day; and consequently that this itself would be
sent to him as a motive to strike out places which were at
r with his own mode of thought. He endeavors to test
subject by Marcion's method of interpretation. He shows
at the very first verse of his text can be accounted for only
the ground of his "docetic Christology." The strongest mo-
e existed for the erasure of the account of the birth and bap-
m of the Lord; while on the other hand it is a violence to
e's common sense to force the meaning of the verb (κατηλθεν)
which in our Gospel is natural, but in Marcion's is en-
ely artificial. Hilgenfeld carries on his investigation care-
ly, and states expressly that the *sections* wanting in Mar-
n's text transcended the powers of his system of interpre-
ion; he could not accommodate them to his purposes. On
other hand he declares that some places prove an exception
this rule, but, nevertheless, they are not sufficient to affect
force for the solution of the general problem. He claims
their behalf that they are earlier readings than our present,
d that the Canonical Text, as we now use it, underwent
rifling corrections." Let this go for what it is worth. On
main question—and this is our concern here—he avows
belief that Marcion altered the Gospel in the interests of
own system; that he attempted by his work of erasure to
rify it from its Judaizing falsifications—in a word, the trust-
rthiness of Tertullian is vindicated, and the accuracy of his
n proved.

And now what effect did Hilgenfeld's critique produce? Will
reader believe it? It is, nevertheless, true—that in 1851,
. Baur published his work on "Mark's Gospel"—which con-
ns a supplement upon Marcion. The "renowned critic"
d been reading Dr. Volckmar (whose treatise we have not
n) and Hilgenfeld. From the opening paragraph of this
pplement, we translate—

> The question upon Marcion's Gospel appears through the opposition which
> been made to the views advanced by Ritschl, and partly by myself, to
> e been forced back to the stand-point where it was before. It is thereby
> blished, that Marcion has altered Luke's Gospel, the determining motive
> refor, being the incompatibility of so many places, with his Gnostic dualism.
> owever, we can speak no longer of a corruption of St. Luke in the sense of
> Church Fathers but only of an editorial superintendence like that indeed
> ng the four Gospels themselves—where the material of the Evangelical
> tory has been prepared under different forms, nevertheless, so far as the
> ter itself is concerned, there is no great difference between this view and
> old one. It is, indeed, now, no longer to be denied, as I have become con-
> ced by a repeated examination, that most of the variations between Mar-
> i's Gospel and our own are, with overwhelming likelihood, to be regarded

specting the authorship of our fourth Gospel, or of the Epistle to the Ephesians? We find fault with them because they display a reckless haste of conjecture in a sphere where conscientious thoughtfulness should prevail. We may, indeed, admire their studious research, but we care very little for their premises in the way of a speculative critique, or for their conclusions. They are among the curious phenomena of a restless age. We apprehend the world will be slow to accept their assertions, since their own faith in them rests upon sand. They are, we know, terrific spectres to ignorant, or to weak hearted Christians who are familiar with them only through hearsay; we grant even that they are often clever in attack, but really their proportions diminish, their frightful mien passes away when men come face to face with them. Historic Christianity, in its Catholic sense and power, shall survive, we fancy, their shifting conjectures, and their negative results. Whatsoever in their methods, in their groupings of familiar facts, in their investigations into periods little known, is good, shall eventually minister to the glory of our Lord Christ. Men who unhappily are impatient of His yoke may hail them as their guides, even though they may be compelled to change their views with each new book they issue. For ourselves, we confess, we have no special admiration of their spirit, nor dread of their destructive prowess.

Marcion becomes then in our judgment, quite a conspicuous figure in the History of the Sacred Canon—quite an important witness for the antiquity of St. Luke's Gospel. Clear headed, wrong headed man that he was, hoping after *his* fashion to bring back the Church to what he considered an estate of purity! There is a dash of enthusiasm about him. Let us not quarrel with him, for his hopes, his aspirations have perished, and we waste not our wrath upon dead foes! The memory of his mutilated Gospel survives indeed, but not perhaps as he would have it, nor any longer in his interests. It survives, bringing with it an assurance that what he found current within the Church as an integral portion of her "Evangelicum instrumentum" had no magical entrance within the fold, but was an ordinary feature of her life. This of necessity rolls the evidence up under and within the very shadows of the Apostolic age. Who can assail, with the testimony of fact, the belief that St. Luke's Gospel then, is a product of that age? Forth from the obscurity of the sub-Apostolic time, the Church issues with this Gospel in her hand, avowing her belief in it as a production of a fellow laborer of the Apostle Paul. In this belief, unembarrassed by the pressure or the presence of conflicting evidence, we are content to remain.

Art. II.—POLITICAL PREACHING.

The Free and Independent Church. A Discourse delivered in Trinity Church, Cleveland, Ohio, June 15th, 1856. By the Rector, Rev. James H. Bolles., D. D.

Our Country's Troubles: a Sermon preached in the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, June 29, 1856. By Rev. Dudley A. Tyng, Rector. Published by request of laymen in Boston.

It has ever been the device of Satan to establish his kingdom by blending it with the political institutions and relations of a country, so as to make it the interest of civil rulers to sustain his false systems. In every form of heathenism, princely rule and priestly rule have usually been seen standing together, like two ancient trees with limbs and roots intertwined, so that, to assail the one was to attack the other, and, consequently, the danger and difficulty of the assault were doubled. Romanism has so far adopted Satan's device, that Popery may be said to owe its very existence now, and its dominion in past ages, to the secular arm, a fact clearly foretold in the apocalypse, where its temporal and spiritual power are represented under correlative emblems, and the kings are said to "give their power and strength unto the beast." It was in conscious weakness that false systems sought thus to ally themselves with temporal rule, and priests and princes were too often joined together, like the upper and nether millstone, the more effectually to grind their miserable victims.

Christianity, on the other hand, was designed to stand alone, asking not the aid of earthly powers, flourishing best when relying least upon them, yea, often most pure and prosperous when they were combined against her. My kingdom, said our Lord, is not of this world. His Church is like a kingdom, inasmuch as it is a collective body of people gathered under One Supreme Head. No one is so democratic in spirit and principle, but that, could there be a ruler perfect in wisdom, power, and goodness, he would say, that poor, fallible, suffering mortals were best under his absolute, monarchical sway, and that a government of the people is desirable only because a driveler, or an inferior, or one but equal to ourselves may be placed upon the throne. Now Christ is a King possessing all attributes of

tion, with not a law in His realm that He would wish to
changed, able to provide more effectually for the interests
appiness of His people than they could for themselves,
nerefore we may gladly submit ourselves to His rule, and
re will have no King but JESUS.

; His dominion is spiritual. Human laws can reach only
tward conduct, controlling not the will, nor the affections,
e conscience; while it is here, where none else can rule,
ur King preëminently reigns. His kingdom affects not
rd pomp and display, too often with earthly monarchs,
vering of weakness, and designed to dazzle and awe where
rorth fails to awaken submission and reverence. The
st majesty assumed by Christ on earth was when He rode
"the foal of an ass" into Jerusalem. The ceremonies of
ligion are simple, and in them the strength and power of
ngdom consisteth not. The first vow of His subjects is to
nce the pomps and vanities of the world. Unlike earthly
ignties which soon fall asunder, however enlarged and con-
ted by conquest, Christ's Kingdom is designed to be ever-
sing, universal, and in its duration, eternal. The pro-
of an empire within an empire, our Lord has solved; for
ngdom co-exists with the dominions of this world of every
and form, diverse from them, independent of them, not
ring with them, neither overthrowing them, nor over-
n by them.

rould seem obvious, that a kingdom so unlike anything
y, must be sustained by a policy, by means and arts en-
different from those by which the kingdoms of this world
aintained. And accordingly we find it so. Not by
nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.
kingdom were of this world, said our Lord, then would
rvants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence.
p thy sword, was the command to Peter. The weapons of
arfare are not carnal but spiritual, mighty through God.
re, uniformly, the declarations of Holy Scripture upon this

As an old writer says, "We advance by yielding; we
y falling; we conquer by suffering; we persuade by
; we become rich by bountifulness; we inherit the earth
h weakness; we gain comfort through mourning; we
lory by penitence and prayer."

there has ever been a great tendency among Christians
carnal weapons in their spiritual warfare, those with
the depraved nature, some remains of which are in the
rate, is most familiar. They are those which advance
terests of earthly kingdoms, and it is natural to think that

Christ's Kingdom can be furthered by like instrumentalities. And here is the defect and danger of the very best of our political preaching. The Ministers of the Gospel are in too many cases, we fear, leaving their own proper work, to introduce into their sermons party politics, or meddle with questions and other matters that belong not to them, and to the great detriment of that cause which they are set apart to maintain. And this is specially the point of our present Article.

The plea for such interference is, that these questions have a moral and religious bearing, and so come properly within the province of the pulpit, which would be recreant to duty if it did not speak out against the political sins, amid the civil dangers of the moment and, moreover, it is urged, preaching is of little worth, except it adapt itself to existing evils, and existing wants. We reply generally, to these excuses, that, upon such grounds, Ministers must abdicate themselves as Ministers, in all the Arts, and employments of life, for there is nothing pertaining to Humanity, that has not more or less of a religious bearing. Though it may be difficult to draw the limits, yet, we contend, there is a distinct and peculiar province in which the Minister is to labor, and that when he steps out of it, injury to himself, and his Master's cause, invariably results.

For guidance upon this point, let us turn to the example of Christ, and of the early preachers of the Gospel. The Saviour lived in a time when civil and religious questions were as much mingled, and in as important ways, as they now are: yet, in all His teaching, public and private, He studiously avoided that which was political, although, as the Jewish government was a Theocracy, He, as God's own Son, might certainly have interfered in that, if in any. He paid tribute by miracle, to avoid giving offense, even when privately insisting on His right of exemption. He was falsely put to death on a charge of treason against Cæsar, albeit the Emperor's jealous substitute was satisfied that the charge was groundless. He submitted to the most unjust and cruel sufferings from the rulers of Judea and of Rome, without a word of resistance. The country in which He lived was torn by factions, and wretchedly governed, yet Christ allied Himself with no party, nor passed judgment upon the acts of the civil authorities. The nearest approach He made to political topics, was in the question of tribute to Cæsar, and there, His exclamation, "Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?" shows His wariness in such matters, and His unwillingness to be drawn into them, while His answer is a perfect model for all who are similarly ensnared in their talk.

; spared no severity in speaking to the rulers and chief
of His country concerning their own personal sins, but
policy as rulers, He sought not to rectify, nor to repre-
Vain is it to reply that the Kingdom of Christ was then
, and in its infancy, and that, therefore, His example is no
l for us, now that the relation of the Church to the world
:hanged, for who ever could have acted the political re-
r so thoroughly and successfully as Christ, when His word
uch power, and when the people sought Him to make
a King? Yet He hid Himself from them.
ın the Baptist, also, fearlessly reproved Herod for his
ery, and was beheaded for his faithfulness; but whether
sided with the Herodians in their Roman politics or not,
) not learn. Paul determined to know nothing but Jesus
t, and Him crucified. He caused Felix to tremble, but it
n view of his own sins and their final retribution. Every-
e we find Christ and His first preachers, though they lived
political and social evils precisely like those of our own
yet ten fold worse in degree, turning from them, and
hing "Repentance towards God, and faith towards our
Jesus Christ." The great Atonement, the work of the
t, love to God, love to man, Death, Judgment, Heaven,
—these were their themes—their only themes. We know
heir opinions upon any one of the political questions of the
We have not their criticisms upon the classic monuments
works of Art amid which they lived. We learn little from
pages of the cruelties of Nero, of the mal-administration
late, or of those matters which swell the works of writers
e Augustan age. They give us little insight into Slavery
then existed; or gladiatorial shows; or other social customs
institutions. All their reference to these things is inci-
al. Their theme was "Christ Crucified;" their work, to turn
from sin, to the life of faith in the Son of God. And here-
ey are our example.
nd, we conceive, that in following such examples, minis-
now are not only most in the line of their duty as Christ's
assadors, but are also best serving their country, and
ing themselves the truest patriots. There is sound philos-
r in this position. All political and social evils have their
n in the heart of society. To convert the heart, therefore,
sin to holiness,—to make men love God, and love their
hbor as themselves, is the sure way, and the only sure way,
ake them good citizens, and, as the work spreads, to purify,
elevate a whole country. There are two modes of keep-
tares out of a field,—the one is, to stand and fight against

those who would put them in,—the other, to pre-occupy the ground; and the latter is certainly the more effective way. It is the mode of remedying evil which our Lord intended when he would have us make clean the inside of the cup and platter, that that which is without may be clean also. Let politicians and philanthropists, and social reformers, pluck leaves from the tree of sin in the vain hope of destroying it,—our every blow, as ministers, should be aimed at the root. If Christianity is the leaven which is to leaven the whole lump, if it is antagonistic, therefore, to all forms of social evil and political misrule, and destined eventually to counteract and remedy them, its victory is not to be achieved by outside warfare and assault, but by taking away that wickedness of heart which is the source of these evils, and by causing men under clearer light, and imbued with holier principles, voluntarily to turn from them. Every other mode of assault is extraneous. It irritates but it does not correct. It creates opposition, greatly embittered too, when the assault is directed by Ministers, from the natural enmity to their Office, and from the feeling that they are perverting their Office to wrong uses. While to convert the heart makes the wrong doers themselves in love with the work of reform, and foremost in it. Greatly do the ministers of Christ mistake, therefore, if, when He has given them such means of reform as reach the root of evils, they employ their strength in plucking away twigs and leaves soon replaced by an ever-vigorous root.

Especially is this to be deplored, since a Minister generally loses influence as a Minister, just in proportion as he wanders from his proper sphere, whether it be to dabble in politics or to dwell on matters of Science and human lore. He does not increase his power to save souls by bringing himself down to the people, in garb, in conversation, in occupation, in being part and parcel with them in all the Societies and popular movements of the day, in wearing their badges, in acting as their orator at gatherings of an Engine House, or their lecturer at Lyceums; but by a consecrated walk, by being known to the people as a holy man of God, a guide in spiritual things, an experimental teacher of the way of life, a dispenser of the sweet charities of the Gospel to the poor and suffering, ever ready when woe appeals, ever wise when wounds require spiritual healing. To a servant of God of this latter character men come with confidence, asking "what they shall do to be saved?" but to the Cleric who figures as a speaker on political platforms, as a pleader for Legislative Reforms, as a Lodge Chaplain, as the popular orator ready for every occasion, where the

ultitude gather; they draw not near with their souls sorest aladies; any more than with those of the body to a physi-an, who devotes not himself to his own profession. They may e the half-secularized minister for their worldly and infidel ough concealed purposes, and applaud him; they may hold im up in sneering contrast with the "sanctified ones"! and atan himself may say, "that is the minister for me;" but in eir hearts men feel that he is out of his place; that he has ough to do in his own peculiar province to keep him ever oc-pied, and therefore they look upon him as a spiritual guide ith diminished confidence. And when that confidence is lost, ough he may say that he will go out as at other times, he will d that his strength has departed from him. The world has ed him for its purpose and then cast him aside.

And when other than evangelic themes find place in the lpit, it is always at a painful sacrifice of higher interest. On ery Lord's day hearers come to God's House, with the inquiry hat they shall do to be saved; or with the earnest prayer at they may be taught how to live nearer to God, and be tter prepared to stand before Him in judgment. Now to eet them with discussions upon political matters must be as ating to their religious sensibilities, as to hear them discussed physicians at the bedside of a dying father. It would not be range if there should be often witnessed, after such discourses, scene like that which was recently beheld, when a Christian, most unobtrusive quiet character, after listening to one of at cast, was moved to rise and express the fervent wish, that at might be the last political sermon they should ever hear in at House of God. We have enough of such discussions in the pers throughout the week. We ought to have God's House d day for other purposes. We might as well have a Sunday per as a Sunday sermon on politics. That was a cutting ire on the pulpit which was uttered when one, on being ked, "What was the news?" answered he did not know, for was not at Church on the last Sunday. Of all men in the rld, Ministers are generally most unfit to handle such mes; for if they study them thoroughly, it must be at the rifice of more important studies, while otherwise their inions are too crude to awaken anything but contempt among judicious and well informed. The clergy cannot bear con-diction, like men who are trained to it in the contests of the litical arena; they easily lose their temper, and they are apt run to excess when once prominently engaged in the civil ifes of the day. It may gratify their vanity more to figure th Goliah's sword than with David's sling, but the sling has

more trophies than the sword. And it will be found, moreover, that active interference by the Clergy in political matters usually redounds to the injury of the very cause they would serve, as well as to their own. When they use carnal weapons, they will find others more than a match for them. When they take the sword, they will be sure in the end to perish with the sword; and, falling in such a contest, there will be deserved the rebuke of that Pope, who, when he complained because one of his fighting prelates was slain in battle, received his bloody armor with the words, "Know now whether this be thy son's coat or no!"

And yet the Ministers, who persist in preaching Christ Crucified, are sometimes accused as being behind the times; timorous, afraid of their popularity, dwelling upon abstractions, living in past centuries, and overlooking great interests immediately around them. They are asked, by some excited parishioner, why they do not let their voices be heard on these great topics of the day, so full of moral concern; and are told it is their duty to advert to them; while other Ministers, who enter into them, are characterized as "the living men," "the men of progress," the popular preachers, and those who identify themselves with the interests of the people. If any Minister be afraid to tell his own hearers their sins publicly, or privately, let him be called timid and time-serving, but not because he will not arraign civil rulers in the pulpit, nor dwell there upon social evils far away. The Clergy best discharge their duty by warning men to repent of their own sins, by seeking to save those souls which will survive when the civil contests that agitate the nation shall be buried in the dust of past ages, and by laboring to remove the ignorance, and vice and misery immediately around them. Faith, Repentance, Holiness, love to God, love to man, the Final Judgment, are not abstractions; neither are they pleasant topics to a worldly heart, and hence this new and cunning device of Satan. To preach these truths and duties can never be, to be behind the times, until time is lost in eternity. The true Ministers of Christ will prevent and correct political evils, as far as they may, by making men good Christians, and consequently good rulers and good subjects; and they will also follow in the train of social and civil wrong, pouring in oil and wine into wounds they could not so prevent. But as to converting their pulpits into electioneering uses, or mingling themselves in the civil turmoils and contests of the day, they cannot, they will not. God has called them to higher work and higher duties.

There is, indeed, a preaching to the times which is preaching

or eternity. If there be a public calamity, like that of the fall of the tower in Siloam, or that of the massacre of those whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, the servant of God may use it for personal reproof and warning to his own people. And he will find a happy model for his guidance in that divine Master, Who, though He stirred up no rage or rebellion against Pilate for his cruelty, took occasion from it to bring home to His hearers their own need of repentance. Here was preaching to the times apart from political preaching. It is in living and moving among the people, and becoming acquainted with their every day wants, and sins and sorrows, that the Minister best fits himself to be their pastor. He may and he will make himself familiar with the affairs of the country, the city, or the village where he dwells; he may, if he choose, quietly exercise his rights at the polls; but all his knowledge of men and things should be sought and used, not to subserve political aims, but to win souls to Christ; even as the physician watches the habits of his patients in their every day life, that he may the better heal their sicknesses. In the world, but not of the world,—knowing men as they are, to make them what they ought to be;—convinced that he has in that Gospel which he has been commissioned to preach, a remedy for every human ill, and anxious to apply it;—so should the servant of Jesus be, so will he be, like his divine Lord and Master.

It is greatly to be feared that the low state of religion among us is owing to forgetfulness of these truths. The old Revival System has died out, and, defective though it was, nothing better has taken its place. Ecclesiastical bodies are rent in sunder, not by theological, but by social and political questions. Great religious societies are torn by factions. Strife and discord reign among the followers of Christ. Neglect of the Means of Grace prevails in rural districts to a degree that might almost startle from their graves the "Sabbath and Sanctuary" loving ancestors of those dwelling there. In many sections houses of worship, once filled, are now thinly attended, or entirely closed, and inquiry shows a large population around driven from their sanctuaries by political "isms," living in entire neglect of the Means of Grace, or assembling in semi-infidel gatherings. 'Where twenty vehicles passed my door on the way to God's House many years ago," said an aged man, "not five are now seen, though there are no more Church edifices, and the population is larger." Thus at the General Association of Connecticut, at Middletown, in June last, "A letter from Rev. Charles Durenne, delegate from the General Convention of Vermont, was read. It gave a very discouraging view of the prospects of

the churches in that State. Many have become extinct. The number of church members has been decreasing at the rate of 400 a year. Christian families are moving out, and irreligious families are taking their places."

"The Narrative of the State of Religion in Vermont has the following confession and appeal:—The external and agitating questions of the age, important though they may be, have diverted us from attention to personal piety, from duty in our closets and families, and from direct individual efforts to save souls."

At a recent meeting of the Congregational Conference of Maine it was stated, that in the Churches of that denomination in Maine there had been a decrease of 1653 members from 1843 to 1855.

The above shows what are the natural results where the preachers of religion give up the doctrine of "Jesus Christ and Him Crucified," for any of the exciting topics of the day. Spiritual barrenness and desolation are sure to follow.

Our cities gather not one-third of their population into any house of God. Romanism has marked and mapped out our land for a possession. Missions have a divided and feeble support. And where are the Clergy? Many of them leaders in the agitation that has rent asunder societies and churches; many of them stirring up their people to contests with evils afar off, to the neglect of evils greater near at hand; many of them seldom urging the soul-saving doctrines of the Cross, but catching up every popular topic of the week, to give a re-hash to the people on the Lord's day of that upon which they have already fed to loathing and surfeit; while the Pulpit has so lost in dignity and power, that Candidates for the Ministry are everywhere decreasing in proportion, and the cry is for laborers for the harvest. Who does not see the cunning device of the adversary in all this!

Will it be said that the picture is not correct, if intended for the Clergy of our own Church? It is conceded that they have not sat for the portrait, though for some among them it will be found a likeness, or with features of resemblance. Our Clergy, as a body, thank God, do preach Christ Crucified, do deal with present evils, do abstain from political topics; nor are we yet rent by any strifes, save those purely theological. Perhaps it may be said of us, that it is because we have not life enough to fight, and care not for civil evils, so that we may but maintain our dignity, and secure our good livings. Certainly, however, we have as yet no very inviting example in the results of clerical interference with political and social contests, among those

of other names, to tempt us to engage in the fray. On the contrary, there is enough that is saddening among them to awaken our truest sympathies and deepest anxieties. If one word of entreaty and warning might be heard by the thousands of ministers of other names now engaged in political strifes, we would beseech them to forsake them, and return to the preaching of the Cross. We believe, that if not a man among them would ever again open his lips upon such themes, but devote himself to the winning of souls to Christ, and the building them up in faith and holiness, it would be better for the country, better for our civil and social interests, better for the cause of Christ, better for themselves in the day of judgment, and that to the resolution to do so, openly expressed, all the people of God would say, Amen.

Nor are we without danger of being drawn into the vortex, and, indeed, we have already enough of the mingling of the political and the religious to render the note of warning needful. We have, as yet, few clerical demagogues, evangelists of new Christs, apostles of progress, platform orators, et id genus omne. But let us beware. We are surrounded by infection. We can hardly live in the midst of it without danger. Let us remember that the holy and the good are the salt of the land; that the prevalent in prayer avert God's anger from it; that righteousness exalteth a people; and let our Clergy ever be laborious in their proper sphere, peaceful, preaching and acting as if they felt that the Gospel was the remedy for every ill, and the great morality was love to Christ. Let us remember our solemn Ordination vow, to give ourselves wholly to our office, so that, as much as lieth in us, we would apply ourselves wholly to this one thing, and draw all our cares and studies this way, laying aside the study of the world and of the flesh.

Art. III.—COUSIN AND THE PRINCETON REVIEWER.

Nothing is more certain than that the taste and the talent for the highest metaphysical speculations are not universally diffused among men. Nor is it by any means certain that the *taste* or the inclination to engage in such speculations is always accompanied with the *talent* requisite for their successful prosecution. Nay, all our observation leads us to suspect more and more a contrariety between the two; so that where the one is found the other is not likely to exist at all—and never, except in those rare instances which mark the philosophical genius who has been sent to us—as once in an age such men are sent—to clear up old difficulties, solve the newly raised problems, and advance and extend over new regions of science the domain of human comprehension. Even among those whose names are conspicious on the page of the history of philosophy—few, very few comparatively have written with any insight of the things concerning which they wrote. Most of them have done but little if anything more than ring new changes upon old words—the common stock in trade of all metaphysical speculators. They seem to assume that the words most commonly occurring, and which constitute the technical terms of the science, are like the terms and symbols of an algebraical equation, to be used without any necessary knowledge of the thing for which the term stands, with no recognition of the fact that everwhere else, except in Mathematics, there may be, and most likely is, some inadequacy between the term used and the object represented by it. In the Calculus, for example, it makes no difference what is the concrete object for which the terms used may stand. The x, y and z, &c., may stand for a certain number of men, horses, masses of granite, stars and planets in the heavenly spheres, or whatever else may become the object of thought and discrete quantification, and it makes no difference with the mode of procedure, or the certainty of the result. We exclude from the scope of our calculation all the matter that constitutes these objects *individuals* in logical quantity, and regard them only as *units*, the last element of discrete quantity. But everywhere else, except in the mere science of numbers alone, the object of thought, be it what it may, enters into the scope of our reasoning and investigations, not as a *unit* only, a mere something having objective individual

eality, undistinguished from other objects by any individual ifferentia of its own—but as an individual distinguished from ll other objects by inseparable properties by means of which t is cognized. Hence, while in Mathematics we proceed in our easonings regardless of the differentia of individual objects, hich therefore for mathematical purposes we regard and call nere units—everywhere else we must regard these differentia; ur methods are determined by, and the certainty of our re-ults depend upon them. And hence the difference between Mathematics and Logic—between the mere science of numbers nd calculation, and those methods and processes of reasoning y which we ascertain and prove the propositions which go to make up the sum of human science in every department of knowledge. This is a fundamental principle, one that underlies nd pervades all Science, and gives to Logic its determinate orm. It is one, the ignorance or neglect of which has been he cause of an immense amount of error, bewilderment and onfusion. De Morgan's Formal Logic is based upon the mis-ake we have just pointed out, and with its rectification it falls aseless to the ground. Sir William Hamilton, with all his earning and acuteness, never fully realized this distinction; or if he did, he did not apply it to the guidance of his specula-ions. Hence his absurd notion of Negative Propositions with ndistributed Predicates, which are impossible in reality, as much so as a triangle with two right angles, and are possible o thought only on condition that we ignore the essential matter of terms and propositions. And to the same cause are we to ttribute much of his application of logic to metaphysical sub-jects in his "Philosophy of the Conditioned." It is throughout tissue of blunders, made in pursuit of this same error; the ame thing is conspicuous also everywhere in his writings. Especially in his Essays on Education the error is precisely he same in kind as if one should undertake to write on polity nd political economy, without considering that society is made p of men, and its forms determined by the peculiarities of uman nature, assuming that it can make no difference whether ociety is composed of men, animals, or mere inanimate locks, so long as they have reality, and may be counted and omputed among the things that are. Words are taken for hings, or rather things are taken for and as implying no more han the intensity of the words which denote them, and evolu-ions, combinations and deductions are made—possibly in due egard to logical formula—but with as little consideration of he things for which the terms stand, as is required in the dif-erentiation of an algebraic variable.

It is, however, a point not settled in the affirmative, we apprehend, that anywhere else than in pure mathematics we can force ourselves by means of Formula and Theorems—into dark recesses—or through obscure mysteries—any further than by clearness of insight, we can see at every step precisely the meaning and signification of our terms—the new ones that arise as well as the original ones with which we started—and the force of every new combination of terms, and its general effect upon the whole process of the thought. We contend, as the inevitable inference from the distinction to which we have pointed, between the mere *unit* with which mathematics deals—and the *individual*—which is the last element in logical formulae and methods—that this point never can be settled in the affirmative; but that at every step of our reasoning we must pause as with each move in a game of chess, and comprehend precisely how the position of the men and the prospects of the game are affected by the change. And until this truth is recognized and acted upon, we have no hope of any important progress or improvement in metaphysical science.

On the other hand, we have a class of writers—who are by far the most numerous in our age—who seem to rely upon insight alone—disdaining the scientific methods, unable to give to their announcements a scientific elucidation and proof, and often holding that these intuitions of the Reason, as they call them, are far above all the deductions of Logic—the mere processes of the mechanical and constructive understanding. Such are the brilliant thoughts that we meet with in the writings of Coleridge, Carlyle, De Quincey, Emerson, &c. The distinction between insight and reasoning, generally spoken of as the difference between the Reason (as the faculty of insight) and the Understanding, (as the faculty of reasoning,) considered as a distinction founded upon a difference in the two classes of mental functions, is, beyond question, well founded, and of the utmost importance. But the great diversity between them which is claimed by Coleridge, for instance, amounting as it does to some measure of contrariety, is not only unfounded in fact, but most delusive and pernicious in its consequences. If there be a class of truths which, in the language of these writers, the Reason can see—but Understanding cannot construe and legitimate by its formulae of induction—generalization and deduction—they are truths which must be considered beyond the domain of philosophy and of human knowledge—truths, therefore, which should neither be affirmed nor denied, since they can neither be proved nor disproved. Doubtless logical reasoning is far more difficult and requires a higher ex-

cise and a wider grasp of mental activity than mathematical. ut it is no less true everywhere else than in mathematics—that e have no right to affirm as true what we cannot prove—*rove*, we say, though it be by different methods according to ie nature of the proposition asserted. And here we come und again to the remark with which we started—the *Taste* r metaphysics—consists, as it is usually understood, in little se than a love of making these assertions which, to the masses f thinkers even, are wholly unintelligible—claiming to be re-arded as profound as they are unintelligible—and excusing emselves from explaining or proving their assertions on the round that explanation and proof belong to the understanding, hereas their teachings are the announcements of the Reason—bove Logic and above Science. The *talent* for metaphysics n the other hand, consists in the ability to take such statements —as many of them as are true, and any of them that are true—nd give to them a scientific elucidation that carries along ith it, step by step, the mind of the hearer or reader—and in hich very elucidation consists, for the most part, the proof f the proposition to be elucidated. Precisely as in mathemat-cs, the talent for mathematics is the ability to see and put n order the successive steps by which a difficult theorem or a roposition of wide comprehension is shown to be true; so in etaphysics, the talent for metaphysics is a very different ing from a love of obscure and paradoxical sayings—which ecause they are incomprehensible, are supposed to be pro-und, and into which men, with clearer minds than their uthors, may, by the dint of hard study, put a meaning that the uthors of those very sayings never understood, nor supposed r a moment to be contained or implied in their formulas.

We are among those who believe Metaphysics to be a sci-ce, its truths and facts to be susceptible of a scientific rangement and elucidation—and that by a gradual progress ich as we have in Mathematics—most persons may, by study, d time, and mental discipline, come to understand and preciate even the highest truths of Ontology, sufficiently for l the practical purposes of life—and sufficiently, at least, to ve them from the perils of error and delusion to which they e exposed by the pretentious arrogance of those who have ore confidence than wisdom—and are more ready to talk an to listen—to teach than to learn.

One of the greatest difficulties in the way of such a result, is e fact that in Metaphysics most of those terms, which in the re abstruse speculations become of necessity *technical*, are e words with which all persons are familiar in their general

acceptations, as used in the ordinary discussions and communications of life. If, for example, one meets in any book the assertion that "in the Parabola the subnormal is equal to one-half of the parameter," he says at once here are terms that I do not understand. He knows, perhaps, that a Parabola is a curve, but precisely what kind of a curve, he does not know. The word "subnormal," he had perhaps never seen before, and he has no definite idea of what a parameter is; and he wisely abstains from expressing any opinion, whether of assent or dissent. He leaves the statement as one which it is no discredit for him not to understand, or be able to discuss—having never had the means and opportunity to master the branch of mathematics to which it belongs. But if one should meet in a work professedly treating of the most abstruse questions in metaphysics—the assertion, "God only is substance—all else is mere phenomena," he perhaps would raise his hands with an exclamation of horror at the pantheism which he would straightway suppose to be contained in the statement. It would never occur to him that in this connection both "substance" and "phenomena" come to have a technical meaning as precise and as far from the ordinary and general sense in which those words are used, as the words "subnormal," and "parameter," are from any words with which he is acquainted in the ordinary vocabulary of life.

We have been led in a measure to these reflections and to this course of remark, by an article in the Princeton Review for April, 1856, on Dr. Henry's Translation of Cousin's Lectures in review of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, and the Sensational School of Philosophy in general. Of this Article, if we were to speak of it in its own phraseology, we should call it an "*atrocious attack*" on Cousin, and especially on Dr. Henry as his translator. But we shall characterize it in no such terms. The use of words in such cases is determined for the most part by the effect which the act produces upon ourselves, rather than from any insight of the design of the author of the act, or the objective character of the act itself. We take, therefore, the reviewer's adjectives as a confession that Dr. Henry's Article accomplished its object—hit precisely where he intended that it should—exposed as he avowed his intention of doing, the ignorance and incompetency of the writer against whose strictures it was directed—an effect which no "attack," however "ferocious," could have produced, if its statements had been as uncalled for and as unfounded as the Reviewer would have us believe. Indeed, he confesses that the Dr's reply—to the previous attack—was

a great trial to his patience and meekness," and we can all
in the expression of pity, if not of regret, that any one
o is so weak in these points should have exposed himself to
such "great trial."

Dr. Henry needs no defense. The Princeton Reviewer is
e first person, we apprehend, that ever discovered that he was
ool, or "entirely incompetent to understand the *first princi-*
s of a philosophy which, for thirteen years, he professed to
ch." Surely none of his hundreds of pupils ever made this
scovery. Sir William Hamilton, whom the Princeton Re-
wer seems to suppose did know something of philosophy,
en, though neither Cousin nor Dr. Henry did, never made any
ch discovery. Cousin himself, it seems, never suspected that
r. Henry did not understand and rightly represent him.
nd we are quite willing to leave the Princeton Reviewer alone
the originality of his discovery, and of the glory which it
ay bring him.

The author of the Review undertakes to prove that Cousin is
Pantheist, or Atheist, and, by holding that God only is sub-
antive, and all else merely phenomenal of Him, destroys the
istinctions between right and wrong, denies human personal-
y, and consequently all moral accountability. And yet he
dmits that Cousin sometimes uses the words "substance and
henomenon" in a way that he cannot exactly understand and
econcile with what he supposes to be Cousin's theory. If his
odesty had been equal to his "patience and meekness," he
hould have bethought himself, that as Cousin is no fool, it is
uite possible that, under the unintelligible sense of the words
phenomenon and substance," as used by him, there may be a
eaning which, if he could get at it, and adequately comprehend
, would solve the whole difficulty, put a new construction upon
e whole tenor of his teachings concerning the Creator and
e created, and relieve it entirely of what seems to him now
nmitigated Pantheism of the worst kind But our meek and
tient champion had no such misgivings. It apparently never
curred to him, that he might be ignorant of Cousin's under-
nding of his own terms and theories. He found many pas-
ges without a single word in them to suggest a doubt of the
rrectness of the interpretation which he put upon them, and
th Omar-like logic he concludes, that if those passages, which
re so blind to him, contained anything not in the plainer
es, they were useless, not needing to be studied out; and if
y did contain what was not in them, they might be neg-
ted as useless.

We have no disposition to defend Cousin's speculations as a

whole, for the reason that as such we do not adopt them. On the contrary, we have already several times expressed our decided dissent from some of the doctrines which he has promulgated. But whatever may be the place which he may hereafter occupy in the classifications of philosophers, we are pretty certain that by no possible combination or arrangement of them can he be classed among or reckoned with the Pantheists. We think, on the other hand, that he will be regarded and esteemed chiefly as having refuted the infidel and skeptical speculations of England and Germany, and recalled the thoughts of men with an eloquence and an earnestness never surpassed in this department of thought and of literature, to those great first principles of theism, of moral freedom and accountability, and of absolute truth, upon which all that is true in speculation, or valuable in practice, must depend.

We do not propose to discuss the point at issue between Cousin and the Princeton Reviewer at length, or even at all, in these pages, and for several good reasons. First, we should not have room to discuss it in a manner that would make it intelligible and satisfactory. In the second place, the discussion could not interest more than a very small part of those for whom our Quarterly is designed. And, finally, we have no system of theology or doctrinal views which are in danger of being undermined by the philosophical speculations of the age. We and our system are moored fast to the Rock of Ages, and the pillar and ground of the truth, so that our position is stronger than any mere system of philosophical speculation. We have no occasion to raise the cry of Atheism, Pantheism, &c., on the first manifestation of every energy or freedom of thought. Our "craft" is never in danger.

There are several things, however, in the Reviewer's method of making out his point that are worth noticing. He seems to spare no pains, and to omit no occasion for a thrust at Dr. Henry, as though the doctor had ever endorsed Cousin as a whole, or had made himself responsible for all his speculations. He attaches no importance to the disclaimers of Dr. Henry and of Cousin, of those very doctrines which he is resolved to have them teach. "Poor Dr. Henry," we use his own words, "is entirely incompetent to understand the first principles of a philosophy which for thirteen years he professed to teach." And as for Cousin, it is nothing more than is to be expected of him, that he should deny and repudiate all the *objectionable* features of his teachings, in order the more effectually to secure confidence, and the adoption of the seminal principles of his demoralizing system. The readiness with which one can thus dispose

the statements of others is always a little suspicious. It may be a mere trick of the practical dialectician. It may result from the too free application of one's own principles and habits of action to the interpretation of the acts of others. But in any view, it excites suspicion and distrust. It leads us to look out for the very tricks which he calls attention to, and is often the first intimation that they form any part of the game we are engaged in.

The Reviewer gives an outline extending over several pages of what he calls the "German Philosophy." One accustomed to accuracy and precision of thinking, or to much caution in his statements, is inclined to ask what system of the German philosophy he means? If he means to merge them all into one, he can hardly find an opinion that may not be set down as included in the "German Philosophy." Germany is something of a great country, and German philosophy is rather a wide and comprehensive field, as those of us have found who have attempted to explore it. It comprehends systems as widely different as the English or the French philosophy—as unlike as any in the Greek language, including the Sophists and Neoplatonists. The Reviewer, however, gives neither extracts nor authorities for his outline, but only adds that he will supply them in abundance if they are called for. Doubtless he can and will. But it may be well to consider the few attempts which he makes at reasoning and interpretation in the present Article, in order to form some estimate of the probable value of any verification he may hereafter attempt to give of his present exposition of the "German Philosophy." Dr. Henry had remarked that it was "incredible to him that any person of ordinary good sense could bring such accusations against Cousin's philosophy as this Princeton Reviewer brings." The Reviewer with great emphasis asserts and proves that Dr. Henry must at that very time have known that such charges had been made. The difference between knowing that they had been made, and being able to understand how sensible men could make them, is broad enough, one would suppose, to be seen and recognized by most men. But it escapes the sagacity of our Reviewer. Again, the Reviewer quotes Sir William Hamilton as proving that Cousin had "adopted the system of Schelling as a whole." And yet in the very passage which he cites from Sir William, that authority says of Cousin, that he was "by no means a servile disciple of Schelling,"—"the scholar, though enamored of his master's system, is SUFFICIENTLY AWARE of the two insuperable difficulties of that theory." We cannot see how one could be "*sufficiently* aware" of "in-

superable difficulties" until he had rejected them. And if so, we must wait to be informed how Cousin could have received a "system as a whole," "the two insuperable difficulties of which" he had rejected.

Let us now look at one or two specimens of interpretation. The Reviewer gives us the famous aphorism of Hegel: "*Alles wirklich ist vernunftig.*" This he puts in small capitals, and repeats it on a subsequent page as "the motto on the banner of this philosophy."

Now for our Reviewer's translation of it. "*All that is, is divine.*" We know of nothing in our reading of German that authorizes the translation of "vernunftig" by "divine." Nor do any of the dictionaries within our reach help us any in the emergency. They all give "vernunftig" as meaning "rational," "in accordance with reason." And our own knowledge of the German *usus loquendi* agrees thereto. To say that whatever exists is rational, so far from being Pantheism, or liable to censure at all, is merely the assertion of what we all believe, namely, that all the works of the Creator exhibit marks of intelligence and design.

One more specimen only have we room for. "He [God] is a Werdende Personlichkeit, an all-comprehending person." It will certainly be news to most readers of the German that "Werdende" means "all-comprehending." "Werden" means to become, to pass into reality; and to call God a "Werdende Personlichkeit" we should understand as merely asserting that He is a Person who is at all times going forth into His works, and manifesting Himself in whatever exists.*

* We promised to give our readers no more illustrations of the Reviewer's "competency," such as it is, and we mean to keep our promise; but we cannot forbear to put the following in a note.

On p. 361 he quotes from Dr. Henry's Translation the following words: "The finite cannot exist without the Infinite, and the Infinite can be realized [i. e., become real] only by developing itself," &c. The words here put in brackets by the Reviewer are his interpretation of "realize." It is true that to "become real" is one meaning of the word, and one which makes Cousin teach what our Reviewer calls *Monism*." But it also means to cognize as real, and in that sense Cousin is saying only that we know or recognize the Infinite only by means of the finite, or, in other words, we know God only by His revealed word and His works.

Again, on p. 371, he quotes what he calls "one of those revealing sentences and illustrations which are worth whole pages of philosophical jargon." It is as follows: "Take away nature and the soul, and every sign of God, disappears." Our Reviewer evidently did not notice the words "every sign," or otherwise he could not have taken any exception to the assertion. For certainly we know of no *sign* or proof of God's existence, except those that are found in the soul of man and in nature; the Bible itself is nothing, except as it is included in one or the other—the soul or objective nature.

Competency and incompetency are but relative terms; and ber this exhibition of the Reviewer's idea of what constitutes *competency*," our readers will have no difficulty in seeing that need not, as we can assure them it does not, disturb the Dr's mplacency in the least, to be declared, by this Reviewer, incompetent," and even "entirely incompetent" for the task s has undertaken.

We have already said that we do not design in this place to o into a discussion of the difficult and abstruse subject in sue between the Princeton Reviewer and Cousin. We know no single formula in which one can express his theodica. It ust be expressed in parts and fragments, now one element and en another. Nor do we know of any writer, not even the riters of Holy Scripture excepted, who has ever sought to ex- ess any earnest living thoughts on the being and attributes f God, who has not at the same time, while developing one ement of his thought, used language which, taken by itself d alone, would be regarded as teaching some false view of eism—as Atheism, Pantheism, or Dualism. How often have e Holy Scriptures been charged by the adversaries of our ith with teaching a *tri*-theism. And we do not now recollect single Pantheistic writer since the introduction of Christian- y who has not claimed, that the declaration of the apostle, In Him we live, and move, and have our being," is Panthe- tic, and consistent with Pantheism only.

That Cousin has shared in this common misfortune is not to e denied. Nor are we disposed to deny that he has gone far- her in this use of language than there was any necessity for, or an can be justified on any sound principles. But it must be membered that he was a Frenchman, that his published writ- gs were for the most part first delivered as extempore lec- ures, to a large and miscellaneous audience, and to be popular ey must be eloquent, and to be eloquent on such subjects, ey must be somewhat extravagant. The Princeton Reviewer s accumulated many pages of extracts for the purpose of bstantiating his charge of that form of Pantheism which he lls Monism. Many of these passages are well enough, and ch the highest and soundest theism, when understood in the nse in which they were intended—when, in short, we give o the technical terms that occur in them their technical meaning, d that only, instead of taking them in their popular and some- hat vague sense. Take for example the assertion several times ferred to, "God alone is substantial, all else is mere pheno- mena." Now, by substance we may mean, in the popular nse, what is hard, or whatever is real. But we may also

mean, as Cousin doubtless did, *quod substat per se*, that is, whatever is *self-existent*, and from which all else proceeds; and by phenomenal, he would mean only the common and universally admitted truth, that all else but God came into existence from Him,—in other words, that He created and sustains all but Himself. If the Princeton Reviewer means to deny this, he must either deny the reality of whatever is not God, and hence is a Pantheist himself, or he must maintain the eternity and the uncreated nature of matter, and hence believe in two eternal uncreated substances, the one of which must be as much and as truly God as the other. We are also ready to admit, as we have in fact asserted and maintained in our preceding numbers, that there are many expressions in Cousin's works—most, if not all, of which the Reviewer has quoted—that cannot be justified on any plea that we know of, and which can only be condemned.

But it is a question worthy of consideration whether his system is to be judged by such expressions. Few persons, we apprehend, will ever comprehend Cousin's system as a whole, and still fewer, even if there are any, that will adopt it. Different readers will take one part or another as they are pre-disposed and inclined. It is said that toads and certain other reptiles suck from the earth, which is the common nurse of all living things, and affords the nutriment on which they all live, —only the poison which is congenial to the constitution of their natures. In like manner, it is quite possible that there is a class of readers who will get only Pantheism from the writings of Cousin. But such minds will find evil anywhere, and we know of no book—not even the Bible itself—to which we could refer them as one that they could read with safety, without the authoritative guidance of the Church, and the analogy of the faith. But what is Cousin's aim? Most men write or speak with an object in view, with the design to accomplish some object. Is it not known that most of Cousin's writings are critical, or if one chooses controversial? Has he not passed in review nearly or quite every system of philosophy that has ever been advocated? Has he not among the rest exposed the error of Xenophanes, and Spinoza's Pantheism? Has he not exposed the two insuperable difficulties of the system of Schelling and Hegel? In short, is there a system which denies the distinction between God and the creation, or in any way inculcates pantheism, atheism, materialism, or denies the spirituality, the personality, and the immortality of the soul, which he has not criticized, exposed and refuted?

This charge of Pantheism or Atheism—for even in the Princeton Reviewer's estimation they are substantially the same—is by no means new in history. It is an old and oft recurring expedient. Socrates was put to death as an atheist. The early Christians were condemned and executed as atheists. Cudworth, the author of the immortal treatise on "The Intellectual System of the Universe," was accused of atheism in his day, (if we remember right.) And there seems to be no end to the use of the charge of atheism against those whose notions of the Divine character and attributes differs from that of those who find it easier to excite a prejudice than to refute what they regard as an error. We remember in our college days, that a classmate, during one of his vacations, called upon a venerable friend of the Baptist persuasion. The old gentleman said to him, "well, Mr. N——, what do you learn up at ——?" Our classmate was mischievous enough to repeat in answer some of the wildest speculations that had been broached, to which his friend replied, "If I should hear any one teaching such things, I should think it was at the instigation of the Devil."

"Oh!" says the young collegian, "we don't believe in any Devil up at ——."

"Indeed, then you are atheists!" replied the pious octagenarian.

Now it is barely possible that one might show that the denial of the existence and personality of the Devil involves a rejection of all proper and right theism. But we are not aware of any process of thought by which such a proposition could be proved. Most undoubtedly the pious old Baptist had no such process in his mind. Nor have many of those other persons who in like manner brand with an opprobrious name what they dislike, any definite conception of the meaning of those terms, or the propriety of using them in the connections where they place them.

Now, granting that all the Reviewer's extracts from Cousin are correctly cited, and in a fair interpretation of them, we cannot see that they were intended to teach anything more than that God is the only substantial self-existent Being—that all else besides Himself is His work—the sign and proof of His existence, and without which we could never know that He exists, and which can no more exist without Him than our thought can exist without our mind or the thinking agent, and that being necessarily a living personal being, creation is necessarily implied in His existence. But suppose this were not the theodicæ which is taught in these extracts; it is to be remembered that they are extracts from divers works in which

Cousin was aiming to refute errors—and in many cases even precisely these very same errors which the Princeton Reviewer has cited these extracts to show that he teaches. As such they are mere *obiter dicta*, and cannot, except by the grossest unfairness, be cited as a fair exposition of his system. Grant that even in the Reviewer's interpretation of them, they contain opinions which Cousin teaches, yet they are not what he teaches. For to say that they are what, *i. e.* that which he teaches, is taking his teachings as a whole and declaring them identical with the sense and purport of the extracts. As Cousin has said, "Of God and the world must be said two things in appearance contrary—we know God only by the world and God is essentially distinct and different from the world." One of these two things only has the Reviewer taken and chosen to exhibit. The other he has omitted. "The real question," says the Reviewer, "is does he [Cousin] reduce the universe of mind and matter to mere phenomena? If he does not, then we concede that he is no Pantheist." But what does Cousin mean by "phenomena?" Does he make "*phenomenal*" coördinate and contrary to "self-subsistent substance?" The Reviewer admits that Cousin's "nomenclature is not fixed; he uses the same word in opposite senses, and therefore frequently affirms and denies the same proposition. Thus he sometimes says that the *ego* is a substance, and the *non-ego* is a substance; and then again he not only denies this, but argues to prove that neither the one nor the other can be substantial." If Cousin has sometimes used the words "substance" and "phenomena" in their popular sense, and at others in their technical sense, it is not strange, nor any more than most, if not all other persons have done. And we suppose that everybody knows that the same proposition may require to be denied or affirmed, just as its terms are taken in one sense or another. In the popular sense of the words "acids are always sour," but taking "acids" in its technical sense and the very contradictory of the assertion is true, "acids are not always sour." So precisely with the word "phenomena," upon which the Reviewer says the whole question of Cousin's Monism depends. In the popular sense—meaning by phenomena only some unreal appearance, as that of a ghost, an appearance which is unreal—a mere delusion—and the case can most unquestionably be made out against him. But taking it in its other sense as meaning only those derived and created existences which manifest and show us the reality of the self-existent and underived, and then assuredly "the universe of mind and matter" may be called "mere phenomena," without implying any form of Pantheism,

and must be so called, or we by necessity deny the creation and imply the eternal existence of what we as Christians have been taught to believe to be the work of an intelligent and bountiful Creator.

We had designed to give some extracts from the writings of Cousin asserting doctrines most directly contradictory of those which the Reviewer attributes to him. But, on opening the volumes before us, we know neither where to begin or where to end. We might quote Cousin's disclaimer of those doctrines, but we have seen that the Reviewer admits the fact of such disclaimers, and how he disposes of them. We might also quote passages in abundance in which Cousin discusses and enforces doctrines of opposite character to those ascribed to him in the Review. But the existence of such passages is also admitted, and thought to imply that Cousin "was not sure of his own ground," [however sure the Reviewer may have been of it,] "and had not given fully his own consent to the system which he had embraced;" "and he had a wholesome and praiseworthy apprehension that the public mind in France was not prepared for the full development and inculcation of German Pantheism. Hence the vacillations, the saying and unsaying, the inculcations of Pantheism, and the avowals of theism, with which his writings abound." If such passages are *abundant*, there is no possibility of quoting them in the present article in any such numbers, or at such length, as to present a fair view of the whole subject, when compared with those of the opposite character, which are accumulated in the article of something over fifty pages in the Princeton Review. Nor, in fact, could we give a just and adequate impression from any extracts that we could quote. Such an impression, we apprehend, could be made only by the whole of Cousin's works, or any one of them taken as a whole, and read through with a constant view to its aim and design. Pregnant, pithy sentences we can find in abundance, everywhere; for example: "The God of humanity is no more separated from, than He is concentrated in, the world." We cannot imagine a more pointed and terse denial of the precise form of Pantheism attributed to him by the Reviewer than in this antithetic declaration, "God is not concentrated in the world, *but separated from it.*" Again Cousin asks, "What is Pantheism? It is not a disguised atheism, as it has been called. No; it is avowed atheism. To say, in the presence of this universe, vast, beautiful, magnificent as it is, God is there entire, behold God, there is no other—this is to say, as clearly as possible, that there is no God, for it is to say that the universe has not a cause essentially different from

its effects." God *not* in the universe entirely, but a cause ESSENTIALLY DIFFERENT FROM THE UNIVERSE, His effect! And yet this same author is a Pantheist, and teaches unmitigated Pantheism of the worst kind!

Our explanation of Cousin's language, and exposition of his theism are not materially different from those given by Dr. Henry himself,* as will appear from the following passages from his preface, in reply to the first attack of the Princeton Review:—

"Now, Cousin not only does not teach Pantheism in either of these forms, but, on the contrary, clearly and abundantly exposes and confutes them all. He maintains the substantial existence of God, and the substantial existence of the universe of mind and matter; of God as distinct from the universe; of God as the cause and the universe the effect; of God as superior to the universe by all the superiority of an infinite uncreated substance and cause over all finite and created substances and causes. Yet all that Cousin says expressly and directly on this subject is kept out of view by the writer of the article, and some speculations respecting the relation of the creation to God, and some expressions concerning the all-pervading presence and energy of God, are paraded as proof of Pantheism.

"As to the speculations about the creation considered as the necessary product of the divine activity: I should suppose it would be readily admitted by any thinker, that if God had never created any thing he would never have exerted his power out of himself, never have manifested himself. I should suppose it would be equally admitted to be natural to the human mind to conceive that God, as an infinite personal cause, a free potential activity, would put forth or actualize His power in some determinate, and therefore finite production, that is to say, would create. I do not understand Cousin as asserting that creation is necessary in any other sense than this, relative, namely, to our conception of an infinite cause personal and free. If he intended the assertion as absolute, I should not adopt it; but certainly I should never dream of considering it Pantheism; it has no more to do with Pantheism than with Polytheism; and as to the rest is perfectly harmless.

"And as to the expressions relating to the all-pervading presence and energy of God in the universe: they are the same sort of expressions as those in which all elevated meditation on the Divine Being naturally utters itself; and the charge of Pantheism would lie equally against nine-tenths of the most accredited devotional poetry, and against the Holy Scriptures themselves, which speak of God as 'all in all,' and of creatures as 'living, moving, and having their BEING IN HIM," etc., etc.—pp. xix–xxi.

Again, says Dr. Henry:

"It may be readily admitted, that in the passages quoted in this connection, there are some expressions which a person predetermined to make out a point,

---

* The final and deliberate conclusion of the "*competent*" Reviewer is thus expressed:—"We honestly think that Dr. Henry is the most incompetent man in this whole sphere whom we have ever encountered, in print or out of it." If this is what he "*honestly*" thinks, we would be obliged to him if he would just give us notice when he is expressing what he *dishonestly* thinks. Or are we to infer that the *honest* thinking, being the exception, alone needs notification?

ight plausibly put forward as Pantheistic, and which a reader predisposed to elieve the charge, and not thoroughly acquainted with the author's writings, ight naturally receive as such. And the same may be said of numerous pas-ges of Holy Scripture. But to any candid and competent thinker, who pro-eeds upon the only fair rule of interpretation in the case of ambiguous or un-arded expressions—namely, that of explaining what an author says by its ecial purpose, and by what he says more officially and expressly in other laces, it will be evident that these expressions, occuring where they do, are irected against the Scholastic way of considering God, which tends to make im but an abstraction instead of the living God; and so in the unguarded fer-or with which he repudiates the "dead God" of the Schoolmen, he may seem o set forth "the grosser God of Pantheism."—p. xli.

After citing several passages, in which Cousin expressly de-ounces Pantheism "as atheism at bottom," as a "denying of od," as "saying there is no God," Dr. Henry proceeds:

"Cousin, then, is no Pantheist. We have his explicit condemnation of it. He oes not confound God with the universe. And to say that he is a Pantheist in he improper sense in which the word is sometimes used, [the "Monism" of the rinceton Reviewer.] to say, that is, that he confounds the universe with God, equally at variance with hundreds of explicit utterances of his. It would be ridical to his system; it would be in palpable contradiction with the numer-us critical confutations he has constructed against every form of resolving the niverse of mind and matter into mere phenomena, [taken in the popular sense f the word used above, and which is the only one that the Princetown Re-iewer even seems to have thought of.] It is the very scope of his philosophy o establish the objective reality and the substantial existence of the universe f mind and matter, as distinct from God.

"The candid thinker will, therefore, see that the expressions quoted by the eviewer, whatever they may mean, must not be taken to mean pantheism, in he intention of their author. The attempt to harmonize them with his mani-old explicit declarations, is required by the simplest rule of justice. And the andid thinker will, I apprehend, find no more difficulty in considering them as ervid, exaggerated expressions of the all-pervading presence and energy of the ving God in the universe, than he does in putting the like interpretation upon many similar passages of Holy Scripture. Yet it is in keeping with the char-cteristic spirit of the article under consideration, that the writer should speak f Cousin as 'not permitting the shadow of a doubt to rest upon the panthe-tical tendency of his philosophy,' and of his 'attempting to forestall the harge of Pantheism,' by the 'not very creditable artifice of pronouncing it he bugbear of feeble imaginations'—thereby intimating to his readers that ousin speaks as one having taken Pantheism under his protection, and so wish-ng to discredit the intelligence of those who dislike it; whereas, the very re-erse (as may be seen above) is the case, and Cousin, disliking it as much as ney, only wishes to guard his readers from the folly of seeing Pantheism in verything, and not knowing when it is uttered or when it is combated."—pp. liii, xliv.

Finally, we assure our readers we entirely concur in the ruth of the following passage, in which Dr. Henry sums up is remarks upon all the charges made against Cousin by the Princeton Review in its first attack, and which in the second ttack are all treated as included in the charge of Pantheistic Monism:"

"I repeat, then, summarily, that the person who wrote the article in ques-ion has imputed to Cousin doctrines directly the opposite of those which he ex-

plicitly and positively teaches, doctrines which he distinctly and strenuously opposes: and the mode in which he endeavors to justify his imputations involves a perversion of thought and language scarcely less incredible. A parallel argument equally valid might be constructed to prove Cudworth an Atheist, Bishop Butler an Infidel, and Mr. Thomas Paine a Christian believer!"—p. xxi.

This is strongly said, but it is true in the utmost strictness of the language used.

It is certainly quite possible that Cousin is inconsistent with himself, affirming at one time what he denies at another. For inconsistency is possible with all minds but the Infinite. But not every charge of inconsistency proves its reality. The charge is quite as likely to proceed from the incapacity of him who makes it, as from any ground in the subject matter concerning which it is made. The parts of any whole appear inconsistent to any one who does not comprehend the whole to which they belong, and them as parts of that whole. What more inconsistent than veins and arteries?—the one carrying the blood from the heart, the other all the while bringing it back, and yet the inconsistency is reconciled and disappears in the unity of the circulation as a whole. Hence the charge of inconsistency and contradiction is made most frequently only by the weakest, and least comprehending minds; they can see inconsistency and contradiction anywhere, and it is about all they can see. The cognition of the unity and the harmony implies a higher and more comprehensive grasp than they are accustomed to.

We are, then, quite willing to leave the charge of inconsistency and self-contradiction, which is the only plea that the Princeton Reviewer, and such as agree with him, can set up after the recognition of the fact that Cousin does in some places, at least, teach the most unexceptionable theism, to those who find any comfort or advantage in using it. We see no inconsistency in his system. We see absurd and innocent expressions, we see everywhere statements that will not bear to be taken and expanded by themselves, we see doctrines that we do not like, and which are not, that we can see, essential or fundamental to his system. Nor do we believe he has built up a system which, as such, will ever be universally received. But we do believe that he has contributed more than any man living towards the progress of metaphysical science to higher attainments, and to the inculcation of sounder and more wholesome views of man, his position, his duties, and his destiny. And we believe that there is no man living, and no man that has lived in the flesh, whose writings in the department of intellectual philosophy can be read by those who have both the taste and the talent for metaphysics, with so much profit as those of Victor Cousin.

Art. IV.—PEWS AND FREE SEATS.

T is the ordinary effect of controversy to push men farther
rt than they need to be, and, by widening the seeming dif-
nce between them, render their antagonism sharper and more
ct than the interests of truth, whether it lie on the one side
he other, or, as is very apt to be the case, partly on both
s, require or warrant. Something of this effect we think
see in the Article in the last Review, headed "Free Seats?—
Pews?" It seems even to have impressed itself on the word-
of the title. And it is simply with a view to rebuke this
ravagant assumption, and put the parties on what we be-
e to be a juster as well as more tolerant footing, that, with
change of the warlike disjunctive into the amicable copu-
ve, the abatement of the fiercely defiant interrogation
nts, and the reversal of the order of the terms, we adopt the
stance of the title and make it our own. We propose to
te on Pews *and* Free Seats.

Whether our opponent will tolerate any such neighborly
panionship, may, however, well be doubted. He is hardly
l enough yet. It may reasonably be supposed to require
re than three months, dog-days included too, to cool off the
er of Quixotic rage into which he has worked himself up.
t we think he will cool in time. And then, as he is the
orous knight, and we aspire to be no more than the humble
ire, and as Sancho's sense, what he has, is common sense,
uality in which his more illustrious companion may per-
s be deficient, we hope to be of some use to him by keep-
him awake to the real world around him, and persuading
not to break his sword upon the fans of a wind-mill, or
a pewter basin on his head for a helmet. Our adversary
st excuse us, if we say that his warmth has considerably
used us. To the more thoughtful portion of the Church, we
ieve, he is his own best answer; and it would be unwise to
l another, if there were not so many with whom vehemence
s for strength, assertion for evidence, and declamation for
ument. His whole Article seems to us, indeed, little else
a string of false issues, a series of propositions which
ody, so far as we know, except as relates to facts, has ever
amed of disputing, and which may all be as true as he
erts them to be, and leave the question in dispute just as it
. So that, on the whole, we may fairly enough claim him as

really our ally, on the principle that a feeble blow on the wrong side is almost as good as a strong one on the right. For, as he strikes always one side of the mark, his blows, however hearty and vigorous in themselves, are feeble in effect, because badly aimed. We insist on calling him back to the true point of discussion, which is not whether the Free Church system is not useful for certain purposes, nor whether it does not embody and represent true and important principles which have been too much overlooked, nor whether it is not in particular cases preferable to other systems and the true remedy of their evils, but whether it is entitled to take upon itself *jure divino* airs, or talk in a strain of special catholicity, and on one account or another claim exclusive possession of the Church as the ordinary and permanent rule of support. Such pretensions we believe to be groundless and ridiculous. We cannot help laughing at them. We may be charged with levity in not treating so grave a matter with more solemnity. But we must be permitted to indulge our vein. We think it is Horace who says, "Quid vetat ridentem dicere verum?" and so say we.

The writer in the Article under consideration, tells us that the Pew-System is not well adapted to the purposes of Church extension; and his argument in support of this position is quite conclusive. We entirely agree with him. His doctrine is true. But we cannot discover its relevancy. We are not discussing the Church's Missionary but her Parochial work. What it is wise or necessary for her to do in the effort to enlarge her borders, and bring men within her pale, is one thing. But how she shall conduct the affairs of her settled congregations and parishes, so as to provide her members most steadily and effectually with the means of spiritual improvement and edification, and supply her Ministers with a regular and reliable support, that they may be without worldly care in their work, and "attend upon the Lord without distraction," is a totally different question; and, we suppose, just now, a somewhat important one. The two departments of operation are quite distinct. The one is the Church acting aggressively upon the world; the other is the Church engaged in the work of internal training and discipline, building up her own children in their most Holy Faith, and nourishing them unto eternal life. What may be a wise and useful system, or even a necessity, in the one, may be most inappropriate and hurtful in the other. It may be, indeed, that Free Churches are advantageous in the Church's parochial life, as well as in her missionary exertions. But it by no means follows that what the circumstances of the latter render advisable or unavoidable, is always

o be retained as a becoming and profitable feature of the ormer. What is suitable and beneficial in the incipiency or orming stages of a thing, is often a deformity of its maturity. Prattle and playthings are beautiful in children; disgusting in nen. It will not do to argue that, because it is pretty in a child to lisp, therefore a man is to keep on lisping all his lays. "When I became a man, I put away childish things." And so may the Church, in its mature and settled state, throw off, as awkward and inconvenient, a system, which it gladly used, as the best its circumstances would permit, in its earlier struggles. Nay, the Free Church System is inapplicable, in its full development, to the Church, even in its aggressive novements. For that glories in being a system of self-support. Whereas Missionary operations, and usually up to an dvanced period of their progress, at least till they issue in a arochial organization, and oftentimes much longer, continue to e dependent on external aid, and give a free Gospel to some nly at the expense of others.

Equally little to the purpose is it to say that Pewed Churches ield a fatal concession to the Free Church System by making ome of their seats free; and that they are bound, in all consistency, to adopt entirely the plan from which they borrow so dvantageously, on the principle that what is good up to a ertain point must be still better without any limitation at all. We suppose the experience of mankind is the very reverse of his in a vast many cases, so much so, indeed, that human wisom is largely employed in marking the bounds beyond which seful things grow pernicious; and, that for the beneficial, in oderation and in combination with other things, to be the destructive, in excess or unmixed, is one of the most familiar and omprehensive laws of human life. Why, if this be not so, hen it ought to be true, that because the small fraction of a rain of prussic acid, either alone or mingled with other substances, is a valuable medicine, a man may drink any quantity f it he pleases with impunity, if not profit; or, because a prinkling of black pepper in a plate of soup is an agreeable ondiment, a black pepper broth must be still more palatable; nd it is gross inconsistency to be afraid of the one, or dislike he other. If this be reasoning, we have our logic yet to learn. We ought not to be insolently told, then, that for Pewed hurches to have some of their seats free is an unlawful pilfering of another's property. There is in the Church no such hing as a monopoly of good. Rather is it the common poession of all, wherever it may be found. And none need the ermission or the pardon of any other in order to appropriate

so much of any system of proceeding as seems to them valuable, and abandon it whenever it becomes false in principle or unsuitable to existing circumstances. We are sorry that our neighbor's equanimity is so much disturbed by the sight of Free Seats in Pewed Churches. We can only hope that he will become reconciled to it by habit. For, it seems not improbable, that upon some well regulated adjustment of the rival systems, which will preserve the most important advantages of both, and exclude as far as possible the evils of either, the judgment of the Church may finally settle as the happy result of the controversy that is now going on in her borders. "Thon and Ziba divide the land."

Thus far, then, we think, the Article before us has made little progress in the accomplishment of its object. The mind of the Church is not likely to be much impressed or influenced by argumentation so manifestly irrelevant and inconclusive. If this is all that can be said for Free Churches, we have no fear of the result. And as their advocate evidently lacks neither zeal nor ability, we must presume such to be the case till the contrary appears.

The remainder of the Article is an excursion into Dreamland, a new Dreamland to be sure, not at all the lovely region of that name we have been so pleasantly led into by another, but a country of dreadful goblins and "chimeras dire." Clearly enough, it is not any part of the actual, extant "Church militant here on earth." It is simply a land of ecclesiastical romance, which has no counterpart in these United States of America, or any other part of this terraqueous globe, of which the geographies give us an account. Now, for a writer to make his facts, and then argue from them, may be vastly amusing to himself, but will hardly be convincing to others. It is to be supposed that a writer means to be believed, and charitable to think that he at least believes himself; but it is difficult, sometimes, without also supposing him to be moon-struck. We have lived all our days in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and our days are not now very few, and we know of nothing that at all answers to his descriptions. Our whole experience is a contradiction of them, indeed. We meet this part of the Article by a flat denial of the whole representation, with an appeal to the common knowledge of Churchmen, using their eyes and enjoying their senses, in support of our appeal. To represent our Church as a broad Sahara of desolation and barrenness, dotted with a few verdant oases, where Free Church Chrysostoms, by "the Puritan Sacrament," are working wonders on men's hearts and pockets equal to any miracles of real or fictitious history,

and thus making a little piece of the wilderness glad, and a narrow strip of the general desert blossom as the rose, is simply ridiculous. The facts are not so. The Church in Connecticut knows that the facts are not so. She has the witness in herself in all her borders, in all her grateful sense of God's goodness to her, and in all her happy experience of prosperity and success in her work, that the facts are not so. She is in no sense Free Church territory. She has not now, and has never had a self-supporting Free Church in all her borders. And yet there is upon her everywhere "the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed," on all sides prosperity and growth, happy pastors and a people "ready to give and glad to distribute." And we do not suppose that her case is peculiar. We speak of her, because we know her. That there is sterility and feebleness in the Church, we know, and quite as much, we opine, if the real facts are looked into, in Free Church quarters, as elsewhere. But that there is anything in her experience that demonstrates a special connection between them and pew-renting, or that indicates the Free Church movement by its effects thus far as the appointed catholicon to cure them, we fearlessly deny; and we appeal in all confidence to the common mind of the Church to sustain our denial. On this point we shall have more to say further on.

The advocates of Free Churches have been wont to appeal to Scripture. In this respect the Article under consideration is discreet. It admits, and very wisely, that there may have been on its side of the question "too much of mere reliance on the private interpretation of some text of Scripture." The sort of interpretation used seems to us chiefly that which first puts meanings into God's Word, and then draws inferences from the inoculated sense in the desired direction. This is a controversial trick no ways uncommon, but unpleasantly like what an Apostle calls "handling the word of God deceitfully." There have been many solid looking structures reared in this way upon very poor underpinnings; but in this instance, the top-heavy edifice on its diminutive base resembles the work of old Cheops on the bank of the Nile turned over and set upon its apex. We never have seen more than two or three passages of Scripture adduced on the Free Church side, and these seem to us almost palpably nothing to the purpose. Our Saviour's command not to make his Father's house a house of merchandise, forbids the employment of Churches for the purposes of secular gain, and, by implication, for any worldly use. But what this has to do with the decent and orderly assignment of places in them, solely with a view to religious worship and in-

struction, for the better accommodation of congregations, and the more regular and certain support of those who labor in them in the word and doctrine, at a stipulated sum, for a longer or shorter time, we cannot discover. And if we could, we should still be at a loss to perceive how the sin is escaped by calling on the worshiper to pay for his seat on the spot, which, after all the fine things we have heard about alms and offerings, and all the solemn reproofs we have received for our low and secular way of looking at things, we still take to be the true meaning of the collections in Free Churches, so far as they are applied to this specific object. Our sensibilities are not at all exquisite or "aromatic." We always took them, indeed, to be of a very ordinary and homespun sort. But we must say, we do not fancy this way of collecting pew rents; and if we should ever fall into the Free Church plan, we should try to get our money from the people, if possible, in some other way, even though we should forfeit the benefit of that marvelous efficacy of preaching of which we read, under which the contents of men's purses almost hop out spontaneously, and close-fisted misers count giving a luxury. When we see these effects, we shall have faith in them. We are not pious enough to take them upon trust.

It is customary, also, to allege St. Paul's advice to the Church of Corinth, on the first day of the week, as God had prospered them, to lay aside of their substance for the purpose of religious charity. But, in the first place, it does not appear in the passage that there were to be collections in their assemblies for this purpose at all, or that this laying aside was anything which a man might not do in the privacy of his home or his closet. And, in the next place, although it be admitted that this is the more probable supposition, manifestly, it was a charitable fund which the Apostle contemplated, and not a fund for self-support, not the means of defraying their own proper expenses, but help for the poor saints "elsewhere," not support at home, but aid abroad. It remained for modern times to find out that a pastor's compensation is a charity, and that giving to one's self is doing an alms, if it is only put into a plate and set by priestly hands on an altar,—a form of almsgiving very likely to be popular, but better fitted to quiet consciences that ought not to be easy, than to produce a full treasury for the relief of God's poor and the enlargement of His kingdom. The blurring of a most vital and important moral distinction in this way is one of the prime vices of the system,—this leading a man to think that he is meeting the call of Christian benevolence when he is simply paying a debt, and making that provision for his house-

ld, without which he has denied the Faith, and is worse than infidel—by simply calling it an offering. The payment of ›ney for the support of the Gospel for one's own good and ə benefit of his household is no more a part of his alms than ı butcher's bill, or the bill for his children's schooling. ıere is as much benevolence in eating a beef steak or putting an extra garment in cold weather. That it thus confuses the ːa of alms, puts the support of the Clergy and of the local ıtitutions of the Church on a false basis, and misleads people regard to the moral nature and value of their own acts, is e of the gravest charges that can be brought against the Free ıurch cause, and one to which its advocates seem singularly tuse and insensible. The Bishop of New Jersey made a far ıter and better use of the text from St. Paul in his plan of ·stematic Charity, which he suggested, and so earnestly and ccessfully advocated a few years since, orginating a move- ant which has been unusually permanent and fraught with ːh blessings. But the Free Church cause can gain nothing ›m it. The Seventh Commandment is as much to the pur- se.

Then, there is that famous passage of St. James about the man th a gold ring and in goodly apparel, and the poor man with le raiment, which is continually put forward as though it ːre decisive of the whole question, when, in truth, it has noth- g to do with the matter. When it is shown that the rights of e poor in the house of God can be effectually secured in no way ıt by Free Churches, and that Free Churches supply an ef- ːtual safeguard, in their actual administration by men, against y infringement of them, it will be to the point. But neither s yet been shown, nor is true. There are perfectly effectual ays of giving all men their rights in our Churches without aking the seats in them generally free. And in proportion as Free Church becomes popular and prosperous, in a word, cceeds, will the poor be incommoded and pushed aside just the same way as elsewhere, with less means of protection ›wever, because there, there is no reserved room which they n call specially their own. If "a bird of the air" tells the ıth, this is not simple theory. In the long run, we have little ıubt, it will turn out that the poor are better off in a Church which they have their own seats secured to them by a com- ıtent authority, than in one which is nominally Free, but in hich, under the transparent sham, seats are appropriated by nnivance, and a pew rent, well enough understood, taken in ımerous installments instead of a few—a result, which, a man ed not be a prophet to foresee, will be reached, if the enter- ise proves prosperous, and simply because human nature will ntinue to be human nature.

But we are also told that Free Churches are Catholic, and that the Free Church plan is the Catholic System, which, therefore, [illegible] without bringing his Church-manship into doubt, and betraying a suspicious sympathy with the spirit of sect and self-will. We plead in abeyance in respect to a term [illegible] if we refuse to look somewhat carefully into the credentials of what claims to be under that name, we must be classed in the sense of a good deal of disagreeable experience. There is no word in the theological vocabulary that has been prostituted to so large or more various service, and unfortunately that has been more frequently perverted to purposes utterly foreign to its legitimate use. There is nothing in the Romanist that [illegible] sets of men to christen their churches and schools Catholic; and this with multitudes of whom less than nothing is meant by any of the merchants. That is a [illegible] and superficial view which may be apt to think of questioning the [illegible] necessity in the details of religious [illegible] regulated by more by authority than by [illegible] the [illegible] of a political party, in which [illegible] is to the greater number an end of [illegible]. It must be said that here neither the time [illegible] the habits of [illegible] and independent examination [illegible] we [illegible] witnessed an extraordinary [illegible] of things Catholic. Antiquity has been ransacked [illegible] and skilful [illegible] we imagine there can scarcely be a thing of striking [illegible] interest to be brought to light. There is no [illegible] of a rule extant, whether it be [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] vessels, architecture, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] climate and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] system and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

nce, that we intend no ungenerous insinuations against the Protestantism of the Free Church cause; for we believe, and re are happy to believe, that it has no especial connection with ny particular School of Theology or Churchmanship. We imply mean, that no peculiar respect is due to a thing because ertain men choose to call it Catholic.

The real domain of Catholicity is narrow, especially, in things utward. It has reference, chiefly, to principles, very little, to orms. In the matter before us, the spiritual equality of men n the Church of God, and the right of the poor and mean to qual privileges in His House with the rich and great, is a Catholic principle. No particular arrangement for carrying t out and securing it, can, we are persuaded, be shown such. Beyond the Sacraments, Confirmation, Episcopacy, Infant Baptism, the Lord's Day, and the rudiments of Liturgical Worship, he area of Catholicity in external matters extends not far. Nothing is Catholic in Christianity that is not at once original, nd intended also to be permanent and universal, to be part of t always, and go with it in all its dispersions. It is not a very asy thing to prove of this or that matter that it is of this description. And all else falls under the head of those "traditions nd ceremonies," concerning which our 34th Article affirms that 'it is not necessary that they be in all places one, or utterly ike; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word." That a thing is ancient, or even primitive, by no means proves it Catholic. It must be further shown not to be one of these variable elements over which the Church has control to modify or abrogate according to her wants and circumstances. That the specific arrangement which the friends of Free Churches contend for prevailed in the beginning—Free Seats, public collections on occasions of worship for their own expenses, &c., is not certain; and if it were, it might indicate no more than that the Church in an age of difficulty and trial found this the best method her condition would permit. And it would by no means follow that it is the best method now, or that we are bound to follow it in this nineteenth century, and in these United States of America. Reverence is due to antiquity, not servility. It may be well doubted whether there was at the beginning any definite system of Church support. There were upper rooms in which men assembled to worship God, and after a time Churches, rude at first, more elegant and costly as means increased. There were large hearts and open hands in the Church. In some instances, men "said not that ought

of the things which they possessed were their own, but they had all things common," and "as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the Apostles' feet, and distribution was made to every man according as he had need." Is this specific way of doing things, Catholic? Tertullian tells us that in his day there were charitable collections in the assemblies of the faithful. "Every one," says he, "puts a little to the public stock, commonly once a month, or when he pleases. All these collections are deposited in a common fund, for charitable purposes, not for the support of merry meetings, for drinking and gormandizing, but for feeding the poor, and burying the dead, and providing for boys and girls who have neither parents nor provisions left to support them, for relieving old people worn out in the service of the saints, or those who have suffered shipwreck, or are condemned to the mines, or islands, or prisons, only for the Faith of Christ; these may be said to live upon their profession; for while they suffer for professing the name of Christ, they are fed with the collections of the Church."

It is doubtful, however, whether these collections were always made in the sacred assembly. For, we are told that the contributions were not always of money, but also in kind, corn, wine, oil, bread, articles not suitable to put into a collection plate or set on the Holy Table—important features of the modern plan, we are led to think. And we do not perceive, either, how these could be given on a spontaneous impulse under the immediate influence of the prayers and preaching in warming and opening men's hearts, which is so eloquently set forth as the great charm of the Free Church System, in contrast with the cold and calculating payments of people who rent pews. We do not intend to blink the fact that the Clergy were supported out of these contributions, however they were given, and other Church expenses provided for from the same source. Bingham says that one fourth was given to the Bishop, one fourth to the inferior Clergy, one to furnish and repair the Church, and one to relieve the poor. How much of this system is Catholic? The truth is, there is nothing Catholic in the matter but the *principle* that the Church is to be furnished with the means of supporting her Clergy, and carrying on her benevolent operations, by the free gifts of her members, bestowed according to any outward system which she may at one time or another deem wise and expedient. If we have read antiquity aright, the ancient Churches contained no seats for the congregation at all. The people either stood or knelt. Is not

his Catholic also? We ought to have free standings, then, nd not free sittings. The Catholicity of our Free Church riends needs, at this rate, further refining and purifying to bring ; to the true standard. A Church in which all men are free) *stand*, well supported by the contributions of the standers n the spot, in our easy and luxurious age, would indeed be a riumph of the Gospel worth boasting of. And when Free hurch effects such a thing, we may give in our adhesion at nce. But we want the pure article.

We are aware, however, that we shall be told that such free-rill support, as we have admitted to be really Catholic, can nly be secured under the Free Church System; and that it is or the sake of this principle in it that its friends love and sus-ain it, rather than on account of any of the details in its ractical working. We demur. We believe there is just as nuch free-will elsewhere, and that a Free Church shelters in s bosom just as much that is false and worldly as is to be ound in other quarters. In fact, it seems to us, that there is owhere else in the Church, where niggardliness and parsimony an skulk so securely as in a Free Church, getting so much ccommodation for so little money. We are told, indeed, that aying the rent of a pew is a purely secular and commercial ransaction, that has in it no tincture of faith and love; but hat what is given in Church, under the enlivening influence f the sacred services, is the offering of faith and gratitude, nd has a religious value as a pure offering to God. It nay be so, and it may not. Hard hearts, it is to be feared, go o Free Churches, and come away hard; cold hearts go, and re not warmed; sordid and calculating minds fail to grow piritual and generous. Some put money on the plate with a lourish, to be seen; others hunt out the smallest change in heir purses, and even substitute that miserable little coin that esembles it, for the half dime. Ostentation and avarice are vorking there just as they are elsewhere. A Free Church is nly a bit of the common earth and air, with ordinary men nd women in it. It has no charm to change them into saints. ts services are like those of other Churches, and attended with ike effects. Hearts are sometimes softened and improved, but hey give proof of it not in obeying a generous impulse at the ime, so much as in permanently bringing forth the fruit of ood living. There are not many repetitions of Pentecost now days. The writer, in the last Review, indulges in fancy ketches on this point, about as truthful as those Chinese pic-ures in which pagodas rest on clouds, and trees shoot out of oof-tops. We are told that money given in Free Churches is

an offering. May be so, may be not. The place nor the form makes it an offering of necessity. If it is an offering, it is so by virtue of the spirit that is in it; and that would make it such anywhere, and given in any way. If a man pays his pew rent in a right spirit, it is an offering. If a man puts money on a plate without a right spirit, it is not an offering. Grudging, or ostentatious gifts, are not offerings, however given. Hearty, willing gifts, are offerings, however given. God knows who are the cheerful givers that He loves; and finds as many probably under one system as under the other. There is many a poor man in our ordinary Churches, who does his diligence gladly to give of his little for the support of institutions which he values for their bearing upon God's glory and man's welfare, whose payments come up with his prayers for a memorial before God, as acceptably as though they had been brought into Church and set upon God's altar. The claim of any superior purity, spirituality and religiousness in the Free Church way of giving, is all fudge. And that men are more likely to give in this way, according to their ability, and as God hath prospered them, is an assertion whose boldness we admire. It approaches the sublime. The contrary, we reckon, is the fact.

There are certain evils connected with the Free Church system, we do not say, inseparable from it, but specially incident to it, which create in our view grave objections against it as the ordinary system of the Church.

The separation of families, which if it is true to itself it involves, and only escapes by an inconsistency, and the loss of the not only pleasant, but, as we believe, salutary association of devotional feeling with a spot in the sanctuary, avoided only in the same way, constitute an objection to which a sneer at sentimentalism is no answer. The only answer is, that in practice the evil is greatly lessened, if not quite done away. Which is no more than saying that a Free Church will soon be a Free Church only in name. And that is just what we believe. This, however, is comparatively a light matter.

A much worse evil is, that it puts the support of the Clergy on a false basis, and makes men believe that they are doing alms when they are paying their Minister for his services, and providing for the religious necessities of themselves and their families, things that have no more to do with almsgiving than buying a Bible or paying the baker or the shoemaker. What benevolent men we should be if we counted our charities in this fashion! All this comes not under the head of generosity, but of duty and a wise self-love. Religious provisions are as much a necessity of man as provisions for the body, only as

hey avenge his negligence less openly and speedily. The ithes that were given to the Jewish Priesthood were not alms. he Jews did not begin to give alms till after they had paid heir tithes. And when God says that in the Christian Church 'they that preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel," He neans to put them on the same footing. Their support is not . matter of alms. Alms lie wholly outside of this matter. It s one of the mischiefs of Free Church that it obscures this distinction, not necessarily, perhaps, but certainly in fact. And his we cannot but consider as most pernicious. We remember, n the course of this year, to have seen a letter from an intelligent and earnest Minister in a remote part of the country, who ad tried the Free Church System, and grown sick of it, in which he alleges this objection with great force. He had ound it almost impossible to get from the people any thing for bjects out of the parish; because, under that System, they ould think they had given alms liberally before the line at hich almsgiving begins had been reached. The comparative iberality of Free Churches and others is obfuscated in the ame way. Ordinary Churches do not put down among their harities their Minister's salary, or what they raise for their own nternal wants. Their offerings lie outside of this line. But Free Church offerings include them, and probably are chiefly omposed of them. Now, are the Clergy willing to be put pon the footing of pensioners, men who live upon alms? If hat be the place assigned them by their Master, they ought to be content with it, and believe it the best. But it is not; and hey do no justice to themselves or to Him in fostering a system in which such a falsehood lurks. The general obligations of benevolence, unhappily, set lightly upon men. And if the Clergy allow themselves to fall into a position of standing mendicancy in society, ill paid already, they will soon be paid worse. We shall have a race of clerical Trullibers, and slide back to the times of which Macaulay tells us—with some satirical exaggeration, it may be, but with quite too much historic truth—when "the Clergy were regarded as, on the whole, a plebeian class; and, indeed, for one who made the figure of a gentleman, ten were mere menial servants"—a state of things as bad for religion as for the Clergy. For, talk about spirituality and unworldliness as much as you please, men will be men; the demand will regulate the supply, and in quality as well as quantity.

The whole tendency of this Free Church doctrine is to render the support of the Clergy precarious and unsteady, and subject the Ministers of Christ to the variable caprices and

numbers of men. He that "hath a pleasant voice and can play well upon an instrument," especially, who understands the art of touching the string that opens and closes the purse, gets [illegible], but such a one may be neither the ablest nor the [illegible]. Vestries or parishes can hardly make reliable contracts [illegible] the strength of that wholly indeterminate amount [illegible] their treasury from contributions, whose [illegible] uncertain value no mortal foresight can predict. [illegible], perhaps nothing but an evidence of faithfulness [illegible] moment empty the Church of the crowd [illegible] preaching or popular music has drawn together, [illegible] permanent tie or engagement to the parish or the [illegible], making no recognized obligation, leaving be- [illegible] presence or fact, in the change. The parish is but a [illegible], and the Minister a mere lecturer to a chance [illegible] under a constant temptation, not to say what is profit- [illegible], but what will attach them to himself, and make [illegible] to his interests. Any voluntary system [illegible] sufficiently enough; but Free Church augments [illegible]. Indeed, it seems scarcely compatible with any [illegible] parochial organization. And it is a significant [illegible], accordingly, we find our Free Churches very often [illegible] parochial form, or formal connection with [illegible] Diocese, standing as a sort of anomaly [illegible] system. A Free Church, indeed, does [illegible] for parochial purposes, a truth which [illegible] Review is candid enough to confess, [illegible] despair of overcoming the difficulty. We [illegible] say that it is insurmountable. But the [illegible] coalesce naturally and easily. They are [illegible] fundamental ideas. They belong properly [illegible] of Church action. And the attempt [illegible] is a transfer of what pertains properly [illegible] external aggressive life into her domestic [illegible], perhaps not impossible, but, as we [illegible] of doubtful expediency and utility.

[illegible] Free Churches. We have not the slightest ob- [illegible]. We wish there were ten where there is one in [illegible] operation. They are admirable missionary [illegible] in new-formed and in populous places. In the latter [illegible] may have a permanent use. Still we are very sceptical [illegible]. Multitudes of one-sided stories will not bear examination. It is easy to set off success against success, and [illegible] against failure. Errors creep into figures with great [illegible], where they are perfectly correct, they may still in-

olve that species of falsehood which is called *suppressio eri*, because they withhold facts and circumstances not capable f being numerically represented, which are yet necessary to a ist understanding and estimate of the case. Perhaps, we are unardonable unbelievers; but we say, that we are, to-day, without atisfactory evidence of a single well established, self-supporting, ermanently flourishing Free Church. We have read a great any fine stories, but we have never yet found one that would ear examination. We say in all sincerity, we are sorry it is so. Ve were taken with the Free Church movement. If we had been vorably situated for the purpose, we might have been tempted launch into it. Experience and reflection have satisfied us that is, in the existing state of society, a pretty but impracticable eory, and that its pretensions to any Divine or Catholic basis re the merest nonsense. We have watched it with no evil ye; and, so far as we have made discoveries, they indicate in very instance either falsehood or failure.

Look at our Free Churches. We mean to speak respectfully nt plainly. "The Holy Communion," New York, is an enowed Church, and to a large extent, moreover, practically a 'ewed Church, and a fashionable Church. We have no wish disparage its excellence or its usefulness. It deserves all onor. But it is not a demonstration of the success of the Free hurch System. "The Church of the Advent" in Boston is ndoubtedly a very flourishing organization. But it is an Inorporation of twelve men, some of them among the wealthiest nd most influential of the city, and has thus far lived under ie healthy irritation of an opposition which has wonderfully nickened its activity and zeal. Some of these Churches have ch Ministers, good and devoted men, we gladly admit, but men ith whom the system is a pet, with whom income is of little r no consideration, and who perhaps are the largest contributrs to the funds they gather. Others have in them some one or wo wealthy laymen, who act the part of patrons, and stand ever eady to make up deficiencies. Others are aided continually y a stronger parish in the same place, on which they either ang as an appendage, or which looks upon them as charitable stablishments for the poor. Some flourish for a time while ie novelty lasts, and then droop and disappear or become 'ewed Churches. Cases of the latter sort are not infrequent. ur eye now falls on the following:—"The Rev. Mr. Ingraham, e learn from the Mobile Register, has been forced to resign is rectorship of St. John's Church. It may be remembered at this church was built as a *free* church, and that the rector as to be supported by the free gifts of the congregation, taken p every Sunday morning, during the reading of the *Offertory*.

This has failed. Hence the Rector has felt himself compelled to resign. Most desirable as free churches are, yet, at present, we cannot see the way clearly, to make it a duty to give up the renting of pews." We do not wish to make an ungenerous use of such instances. Particular cases of failure do not prove much. But they are just as good as opposite cases adduced on the other side.

The Article we are now replying to tells us of three instances in which feeble and languishing Pewed Churches have undergone a wonderful renovation by being made Free. There may be other elements in this change besides the efficacy of Free Church. But we will not be critical. At least, they are all yet recent cases. Novelty gives an impulse to things always. Perhaps, after a time they will need to change back again, and try a new renovating process. But we are quite willing that they should flourish on their present plan. We are more than willing that Free Churches should prosper. It is quite conceivable that under suitable circumstances they may prosper, and do better than Pewed Churches. We have always been disposed to wonder that the number of actual cases of success is not greater.

Some of the Free Churches of which we hear are very aprocryphal. We were amused some time since to see arrayed on the list an old acquaintance that we greatly love, but never dreamed of calling a Free Church,—a quiet rural parish made up of excellent people, that has continued long without change or growth, and now after about three quarters of a century numbers nineteen families, and pays its minister three hundred dollars. It does not, indeed, rent its pews, but raises its salary by an annual subscription, and its pews are occupied by a prescription so firm, that, a few years ago, when some improvements were made in its venerable house of prayer, a proposed alteration was rejected, because it would disturb an honored family that for several generations had been quietly ensconced in an ample inclosure in one of its corners. How many Free Churches of a similar sort there may be, we cannot say.

The picture which our Reviewer draws of the condition of things out of the bounds of Free Church blessings is truly deplorable. But happily he has drawn upon his fancy for his facts. If success is to be taken as the criterion of comparative excellence, we will undertake to furnish ten instances of striking progress to his one. Such statements as this, for instance, can only excite a smile:—"On the broad and generous shoulders of the one, rests a robe of the richest perennial verdure, ever watered by the dew of Hermon which falleth upon

he hill of Zion. On the bald and peeled scalp of the other, light and barrenness are spread out, like the dreary drought nd desolations of Gilboa, where the Lord departed even from is own Anointed, and left him whose love passed the love of women, to fall beneath the sword of the uncircumcised." What the man means we cannot imagine. Transpose the application of the images, and we shall arrive at a much closer approximation to the truth. We quote the passage as a specimen f rodomontade not easily matched.

It is not necessary to descend into particulars. Every man's experience furnishes him with instances more than sufficient or our purpose. The whole Diocese of Connecticut, which as grown, during the Episcopate of its present venerated Bishop, from *thirty-three* parishes to a *hundred and twelve*, and rom *seven* that supported a Minister to between *eighty and ninety*, and has never had within its borders a self-supporting Free Church, rises up in just resentment of such calumny. There are, indeed, now, three Missionary stations in its two largest cities, conducted on the Free Church plan, all, we are happy to say, doing well, prosperous and successful. The Minister of the oldest and strongest of them has expressed to us his entire assent to the Article entitled "Free Churches Again," in the January Number of the last volume of this Review, and his conviction that the effort in which he is engaged will never attain permanent establishment, and strength to stand alone, without an abandonment of the Free Church System. And we prophesy of the others, that if they grow, as we trust they will, into stable and self-supporting parishes, they will modify their plan of operations, and become substantially like the parishes around them. If, however, they grow into all that their most ardent friends desire in their present form, we shall rejoice in the result. We have no fanatical ultraism to be gratified by Free Church failures, though we doubt, whether, under ordinary circumstances, Free Churches are on the whole salutary, even if they are practicable. But if success and growth are a criterion of value, and an evidence of the Divine favor, Churches supported in the ordinary way enjoy them largely. The venerable Dr. Croswell, in a discourse delivered a year or two ago, on the fortieth anniversary of his settlement in New Haven, exhibits results as the fruit of his labors, and those of his co-workers in the field, which cannot fail to awaken admiration and gratitude. Within the area occupied at the beginning of that period by a single congregation of moderate size, are now eight, several of them larger than that then was, and all vigorous and growing. No part of all this increase is due to Free Church influence; for the two congregations that are now conducted on the Free Church

System are yet recent and experimental, and must be regarded as the effect, and not the cause, of a redundant prosperity. It was our privilege, within a few weeks, to be present at a pleasant reunion of the Sunday Schools of several neighboring parishes in the open air, and to hear a Clergyman, who had formerly been the pastor of two of them, then united as a single cure, address the assembled company. Twenty years ago there were in these two parishes about seventy communicants; there are now about two hundred and fifty, and in one of them sixty have been added in the last two years. And they are village parishes, amidst a population not growing rapidly, and favored by no specially advantageous circumstances. We see in their growth nothing beyond the fruit of the divine blessing on faithful parochial labor. They are not Free Churches; but they present anything but "a bald and peeled scalp," covered with "blight and barrenness." We are continually conversant with a parish, which, a few years ago, called its present Rector to the charge of it, at a salary of six hundred and fifty dollars. This sum was then raised with some difficulty; and little was done for objects out of the parish. It has since built a Church at an expense of nearly sixty thousand dollars, of which it owes but sixteen hundred, and has purchased a lot and laid by the requisite means for the erection of a parsonage. It reported the present year nearly eighteen hundred dollars of contributions, besides its ordinary current expenses, having never been taught to account the salary of its Minister, sexton, &c., a part of its alms. Such cases are not exceptional and uncommon. It were easy to multiply instances to weariness. These have been taken simply because our knowledge of them is direct and familiar, and we can say of them, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." The representations in the last Review on this subject are a mere romance, whether we refer to the glowing pictures on the one side, or gloomy sketches on the other, and only serve to show to what a marvelous extent an ardent mind can clothe objects with the hue of its own prejudices, and how, though

> "Optics sharp it needs, I ween,
> To see what is not to be seen,"

a fervid partisan can accomplish even that difficult feat.

But we must not close without rendering to the Free Church movement its due. The Church, we believe, owes it a considerable debt. It has done good, and is doing good. We will not be uncandid and unfair to it, because some of its advocates are extravagant and partial. It has done good; but, as we believe, like the great temperance movement, to which it is in

many respects akin, more by its indirect influence than in its direct results. We shall be sorry, if, by becoming a fanaticism, it abridges its usefulness. We have no doubt the Church needed it, and that in its origin it was a symptom of life, the outspeaking of an irrepressible conviction. It stands among us the witness for great truths and solemn obligations, too long slumbered over and neglected. It testifies to the spiritual equality of men, and the rights of God's poor, too much forgotten, too little cared for. It has done much to awaken attention to them, and call forth efforts in their behalf. We trust it will do yet more; and if there is anything that makes us doubt of it, it is the arrogant, bitter and ungenial tone it seems to be assuming. Its best fruits, we believe, will be realized beyond its own boundaries, more in what it reminds and stimulates others to do, than in what it does in its own direct line of action. Its theories, we think, to a large extent impracticable, its purposes Utopian, its zeal sometimes Quixotic. But it has truth in it, and important truth, truth too little thought of, and earnest and able friends who will do with it all that can be done. There is some empiricism about it, but not a little reality. We have the vanity to think that we are better friends to it than some of its imprudent champions. It is fairly before the Church, and we have no doubt will, in the end, be fairly dealt with. If it gains a permanent foothold in the Church, and continues to occupy a certain sphere within her borders, we shall never quarrel with it, but hail it as a respected companion and coadjutor. If the mind of the Church should finally adopt it as *the* system, exclusive or principal, if we live to see the day, we will be as loyal to it as the warmest friends it now has. In a modified form it will probably continue and be useful. We hope it will. In the full latitude of its pretensions and expectations it will prove a bubble that will soon break and disappear. As such it will only be known in that immense repertory of impracticable projects which the Church lays up for the amusement of curious antiquarians—amidst ingenious whirligigs that cannot be made to go, and perpetual motions that have ceased to move, because they were planned and constructed with an innocent but fatal forgetfulness of the constitution of human nature, and the friction of human society—labelled—The Free Church Dream of the Nineteenth Century.

Art. V.—THE ENGLISH PURITANS.

1. *William H. Seward's Oration at Plymouth Rock*, Dec. 24, 1855.
2. *Rev. Dr. Zachary Grey's Impartial Examination of Neal's History of the Puritans.* Three Vols. London, 1736, 1737, 1739.
3. *History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration of Charles II.* By M. Guizot. Translated by A. R. Scoble. Two Vols. London: Bentley, 1856.

We certainly are disposed to honor the zeal with which the descendants of the old Puritans rally from all parts of the country, and in midwinter too, to celebrate the landing of their forefathers from the May Flower on Plymouth Rock. We wish our Virginia brethren were equally true to themselves and to their noble ancestors. Is this forgetfulness of Jamestown owing to the fact that the Church has shrunk into an insignificant body, numbering a communion in Virginia of only about *six thousand*, among the *one hundred and twenty-seven thousand* who now profess and call themselves Christians? We have no heart to cast reproaches upon our brethren in the Old Dominion; and yet we confess to feelings of mortification and sadness, and we cannot but raise certain inquiries, when we find the Bishop of Virginia, in his late historical papers, saying:—

"The Episcopalian cannot but think with melancholy feelings of the gradual decline, as to numbers, of the church in Accomac, from the time of Mr. Black, in 1710, to the present day. Then, in one parish only, the upper, there were four or five hundred families, three overflowing churches, and two hundred communicants, with scarce a dissenter in it. Now, in both parishes, covering the whole county, there are only three churches and about fifty communicants. Other denominations, chiefly the Methodists, have drawn away the great body of the people from our communion."

Of course, life in any form or shape is better than no life at all. God forbid that in these days of worldliness, and self-indulgence, and self-seeking, we should fail heartily to sympathize with those manifestations of true spirituality which our Southern brethren are now exhibiting. And yet we cannot

hesitate to say, that Christ's visible and appointed Ordinances of Grace, so far from being hostile to Evangelical Doctrine and vital purity, are yet intimately connected therewith. So all history proves, as we shall by and by show. In the New Testament the Church is set forth, not as a mere system of Truth, but as a visible Institution, clothed with certain distinct duties, responsibilities, instrumentalities and honors; and we are never true to her, to her Great Head, or to ourselves, until, regardless of a scoffing world, we hold the Church in our affections as Christ did. Much less ought the faithful use of Christ's Ordinances to be exchanged for the "Revival System," so called, a system which the sects around us formerly adopted, which, for the time being, swept everything before it, and yet which is now almost as generally discarded, as both false in theory and evil in tendency. Even the Methodists, we see, are feeling their way back to something truer and safer. The history of the Church in Virginia, the blighting and mildew which characterized its ante-revolutionary period, is well calculated to generate distrust even of Divine Institutions. So one extreme begets its opposite. But the best blood of our country once flowed in the veins of the sons of Virginia, "the Mother of Presidents," and there is no better material in our whole country now of which to make devout and loyal Churchmen. Let us hope that the days of the Church's humiliation and shame are ended in a field once within her entire control.

The Puritans, at least, do not mean to let the memory of the "May Flower" die. And if there are some strange contrasts in the two classes of persons; if, for one example only, the noise of revelry, of the harp, and the viol, and the dance, is now heard, instead of that "Psalm-singing" which alone the old Roundheads in their early days admitted, even on the most festive and joyous occasions, we will not quarrel now with the taste of either. But when, year after year, most persistently and systematically, we find certain virtues ascribed and principles attributed to those old Puritans, the very opposite of those which they really possessed, and when this false position, in which they are held up, necessarily, we will not say purposely, is made to reflect odium upon other actors beside the Puritans in those stormy times; in other words, when popular prejudice is thus brought to bear upon the Church of our affections, then we think it time to give to these Plymouth Rock celebrations a little of our attention. The bold and effectual manner with which the lamented Wainwright once publicly met and rebuked this Church hatred on a similar occasion, is of course fresh in the memory of our readers. It should never be forgotten with

what chivalry and skill he bore himself in that protracted controversy, and showed himself the gentleman, the scholar, and the Christian. We need not say that it is a most ungracious task, thus forced upon us, to be compelled, even for the truth's sake, to give the more repulsive shades to a picture glowing under the zeal of partiality or ignorance.

That the Puritans were men of certain stern heroic virtues;

That they shared these virtues, not as Puritans, but as Englishmen, and inherited them as the legitimate fruit of that noble old Church from which they sprang, and of principles which had already been engrafted into the common mind and common law of the realm, hundreds of years before Puritanism was ever heard of;

That the Puritans were, in theory and in practice, as bitterly intolerant as any class of men who ever lived;

That the American Constitution was the outgrowth, not of Puritanism, but of principles already embodied and practically exhibited in the different Colonies of New York, Maryland and Virginia, as well as of New England;

That Free Toleration in religion was publicly and solemnly abjured by the Puritans, and in this country, when actually established, was the result of absolute necessity, rather than of conscientious conviction;—for the Puritans, at the Revolution, took special pains to have their own religion established as the State Religion;

All these are facts, about which there is no room for dispute, and the truth of which we should have supposed Senator Seward too intelligent a man not to have known.

But Mr. Seward, in his Oration at the celebration at Plymouth Rock, has fallen into the same old beaten track, repeated the same old story, and sung the same old tune. Abuse of the Church, and glorification of Puritanism, is of course the one great theme at these Plymouth Rock Anniversaries. We pass by the greater part of Mr. Seward's Oration, with the single remark, that we detect in it the one-sided authorities and sources of information on which he has relied. We suppose there is no one man who has done more to shape public sentiment on this subject than Daniel Neal; and yet of all modern historians we know of no one so thoroughly unreliable, and so constantly to be distrusted in all points of controversy as he. We propose briefly to examine certain social and religious elements in the character of the Puritans, as depicted by the Orator. He describes the English and American Puritans as distinguished for their "moderation;" their entire devotion to the great principles of "religious liberty;" as men "of noble tem-

per and spirit, faithful, patient, and persevering;" as men "who forgot themselves, and their own immediate interests and ambition." He says, "The Puritans thus persisted and prevailed, because they had adopted one true, singular and sublime principle of civil conduct, namely, that the subject in every State has a natural right to religious liberty of conscience." And finally, to cap the climax, in which we hardly know whether to wonder most at its irreverence or its absurdity, he says, "The Puritans came into the world to save it from despotism, and the world comprehended them not."

Now, as either simple affirmation or denial on such a question is valueless, we propose to give, from authentic histories of those times, a few pages concerning those very points on which Mr. Seward has expended his eulogy. We do not here enter at all into a greater question, to wit, the origin of that element of religious and civil liberty which was already engrafted into the English Constitution. He is of course a blockhead who does not know what Guizot, in his late History of Richard Cromwell and Charles II, has so clearly proved, that the principle of freedom, the protection of the English subject, his life, liberty, property, honor and conscience were already guaranteed to him by MAGNA CHARTA, and were no more indebted to the Puritans for their origin than they were to Shah Allum, the Great Mogul. To identify Puritanism with civil and religious liberty is, especially in the United States, a popular but superficial mistake; for the Puritans, in the Old World and the New, never hesitated to persecute when it would serve their purpose. Our object now, we repeat, is to invite attention to one or two features in the social and religious character of the English Puritans. The intolerance of the Puritans in the New England Colonies has already been made to appear in our pages. We now propose to describe those men in England on their own soil. We shall simply give the facts, without a word of comment, and leave these facts to speak for themselves. Perhaps on another occasion we may present another chapter bearing upon the character of the Puritans in another aspect. The materials before us are rich and abundant. We only regret the necessity which compels us to use them. Let us, then, read a little, sober, unvarnished history about these "patient," "self-forgetting" Puritans, as Mr. Seward calls them, "who came into the world to save it from despotism, and the world comprehended them not."

The following account of the atrocities of Cromwell and his bloodthirsty followers, is taken from Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland, pp. 333–368.

"1650, in the month of June, about three thousand horse and foot of his Majesty's being defeated near Letter-Kenny, by the English rebels adhering to Cromwell; most of the principal officers of the said party taken prisoners in the battle were killed in cold blood, by order of Sir Charles Coot, late Lord of Montrath, notwithstanding they had quarter from the officer who took them prisoners. 1652, Colonel Barrow, of Cromwell's army, having taken an island (in the County of Monaghan) defended by Lieutenant Colonel Patrick, and Mr. Mahon, for his Majesty, after killing the said Lieutenant Colonel and his soldiers, put all the women and children to the sword to the number of eighty; among whom, a little pretty child of six years old being spared by the soldiers was killed by order of the said Colonel Barrow.

"Anno 52. Redmond Burke, a Colonel in his Majesty's army, had quarter given him by some of Colonel Coot's men, he being taken in a skirmish between Colonel Grace and some of Cromwell's party, and being prisoner for some time, Colonel Henry Inglesby caused his head to be cut off.

"Anno 52, 53. It was an usual practice with Colonel Stubbers, then Governor of Galloway, to take the people out of their beds at nights, and sell them for slaves to the Indies, and by computation he sold out of the said county above a thousand souls. 1649, Captain Harrington, a Protestant, and three hundred officers and soldiers, taken prisoners at the defeat given his Majesty's army before Dublin, were after quarter given, put to death by order of Colonel Michael Jones.

"Mr. Wogan, of Ratchoffy, having quarter given him in the same time, by Captain Ottoway, was killed by Lieutenant Tomson, as he rid behind one of Ottoway's troopers; and one Mr. Hinny, an aged person, after dividing his goods to the value of fifteen hundred pounds among the soldiers, was knocked in the head, together with his daughter, her husband, and four children, after quarter.

"*Note*, That no less than* twelve thousand of the poor inhabitants of that County [Dublin] were massacred the first year of the war.

"Anno 51. Captain Hulet coming to Sir John Dongan's house at Castle-Town, [County of Kildare,] to search for a Priest, tortured a child of Sir John's, of seven years of age, with lighted matches, to force a confession from him where the Priest was, and the poor child not telling, or not knowing, Hulet hung him up with the reins of his bridle, but the troopers, when Hulet's back was turned, cut him down half dead, whereof the child died soon after.

"1647. Three thousand soldiers, at the battle of Dongans-Hill,

"* Sir William Petty, (says Mr. Carte, History of the Life of James First, Duke of Ormonde, vol. i, p. 178,) who had a head excellently turned for calculation, had been soon after the war in every part of the Kingdom, and had surveyed the whole of it, and had sufficient opportunities of information, and was neither by interest nor inclination disposed to favor the Irish; and yet he thinks that there were only *thirty-seven thousand British massacred in all the first year of the troubles*, and that those who think that there were greater numbers destroyed, ought to review the grounds of their opinion."

[County of Meath,] were killed after quarter given them by Colonel Michael Jones and many Irish officers, taken in the battle, and deeply wounded, were killed, the next day after, when they could not march on foot.

"1650. Colonel Daniel Axtel cut off the head of Mr. Fitz Gerret of Browneiford's Son, and hanged the sons of Mr. Butler, of Ballikify, and Mr. Butler, of Benidstown, [County of Kilkenny,] because their fathers inlisted themselves in his Majesty's army.

"One Francis Frisby, an Englishman, and a Protestant, Butler to the Duke of Ormonde, having had quarter upon the rendition of Kilkenny to Cromwell, was apprehended by the said Colonel Axtel, and for not confessing his Lord's plate, was tortured to death, by burning matches between his fingers, in the Castle of Kilkenny.

"1651. Major Shertal, an officer of his Majesty's army, having delivered the Castle of Ballimay, upon quarter of life and liberty, to Colonel Axtel, was run through the body by the said Colonel, and all his soldiers, to the number of one hundred and ninety, were killed.

"1651. Captain Thomas Shertel, a Captain of Horse in his Majesty's army, coming to Kilkenny upon a safe conduct, was hanged by the said Axtel, because he had a good estate within two miles of Kilkenny.

"1650. Colonel Axtel hanged fifty of the inhabitants near Thomastown, living under his protection, for no other reason, but that a party of Cromwell's army was defeated the day before in that place, by some of the Royalists.

"Colonel Axtel, meeting one day forty men, women and children, near the wood of Kildonan, who were coming for greater security to live within his quarters, caused them all to be killed.

"Some soldiers of the King's army being taken in a village in Grace's Parish, Colonel Axtel caused all the inhabitants to be apprehended, hanged three of them and sold the rest to the Barbadoes.

"1650. The said Axtel* (as matter of recreation) commanded his

---

* "'Tis no wonder that so bloody a regicide as Axtel, who had embrued his hands in the blood of his anointed Sovereign, should sport himself in the butchery of so many innocent persons. This man was a *grocer*, by profession, and went forth but a common soldier. But (as is observed by Mr. George Bates in his Life, Lives, Actions, and Executions of the Regicides, 1661, p. 63,) 'That in his expedition to Ireland, he soon commenced Colonel. And it is strange what hellish cruelties he used there, not only against the native Irish, whom he would murder like vermin, but even against *Protestants* and *English*, not favoring either, though he had not only promised, but assured them Quarter. He was made Governor of the county and city of Kilkenny, and here he shows his cruelty so conspicuous, that his very merciless brethren of the army condemn him. He hanged what gentry of the county he pleased, whether guilty or not, never affording them any trial, but making his own will his law; he exercised it according to his discretion, by reason whereof many innocents causelessly suffered, and for which his own brethren of the army drew up articles against him in a Court Marshal, and he had then received punishment, had not the *Anabaptists*, and Charles Fleetwood, at the head of them, at that time being the predominant party, passed by the business.'

"'Tis observed by Mr. Walker, (History of Independency, Part 2, p. 255,) in general, 'That these bloody saints that accompanied Cromwell into Ireland,

troops to gather together a great number of the protected people near Kilkenny, and being all in cluster, bid the troops rush through them, and to kill as many as happened on the left hand of the troop, and to spare the rest; thirty persons were murdered then, and on that account.

"1651. Colonel Cook, in one march out of Iniscorphy, into the barronies of Bellaghkene and Goury, [County of Wexford,] murdered a hundred poor laborers in protection, and five hundred women and children, whom he caused to be locked up in their own houses, commanding his soldiers to set fire upon them; and one woman having escaped out of a house, was killed, and her belly barbarously ripped up; others thrust their sucking babes out of the windows, hoping that their innocency might beget pity in the soldiers, who, by their Colonel's command, received the poor infants upon the heads of their pikes, and thrust them back into the fire.

"1650, 1651. The said Colonel Cook, in his several marches into the barronies of Bellaghkene and Skarawalsh, murdered upwards of three hundred men, women and children, under protection, yet the wife and children of this Cook, (notwithstanding all his barbarous cruelties committed against the King's subjects, and having always eminently appeared against his Majesty and his Royal Father,) have been so well befriended as to be provided for by special name in his Majesty's declaration for the settlement of Ireland.

"1650, 1651. Captain Thomas Barrington murdered no less than three hundred men, women and children, under protection, in the barronies of Goury and Bellaghkene.

"1650. The said Barrington killed fifty women and children at a place called Layen; he was so noted through Cromwell's army for his cruelty, that they called him *Barrington kill all.*

"The above Colonel Cook caused twenty-two of Sir Walter Dongan's men taken at the fight of Clonighall, to be killed after quarter given, and one Captain Birn, of his Majesty's army, wounded in the fight, and much made of by some of Cook's men, who took him prisoner, was soon after stript and killed.

"Major Thomas Hart forced a country fellow, under protection, to leap into the river of Boina, and took pleasure to see him drowned.

"1650. Captain William Bolton, of Colonel Pretty's regiment, slaughtered about two hundred and fifty men, women and children, under protection, in the said barronies of Skarawash, Bellaghkene, Bentry, and Gillmalere.

(to make that Kingdom as miserable and slavish as they had done this,) did pour forth the blood of their own bowels, in great abundance; God's vengeance having visited most of them with the bloody-flux; whereof many died: but that was a secret that was not to be known to the ungodly; and therefore O. Cromwell, and his Council of War at Dublin, made an order, that if any person, residing within that garrison, whether inhabitants or soldiers, should (upon pretence of writing to their friends) signify the transactions of the army, (between O'Neal and O. Cromwell, it may be,) or their engagement with the enemy, so as to set forth their success or loss, until the General Council of War have signified, (falsified the same to the Parliament of England,) they shall incur the breach of the Article against Spies, and be accordingly punished with death."

"1650. The same Bolton gave quarter at Castle-Kirk to nine soldiers, who, after delivering their arms, were slaughtered by his order.

"1650. Mr. Pierse Butler, eldest son of the Lord of Galmoy, and Captain of horse in his Majesty's army, being taken prisoner in the fight, was killed in cold blood, after quarter, by the said Bolton.

"1651. The said Bolton hanged Pierse Doran, who collected his contribution, at his own door, and one of his servants to keep him company.

"1651. Nicholas Lenagh, a man known to be frantic, was killed in his own house, by the said Bolton's orders.

"1651. Colonel Pretty meeting one day upon the road with Mr. Philip Hill, a gentleman of his acquaintance, and his Collector in the barrony of Bellaghkene, hanged him on the next tree.

"1649. A soldier of Cromwell's being killed by some of the Irish army, Colonel Jeremy Sankey summoned all the inhabitants of the Parish, wherein he was killed, being under his protection, to come to Fethered, [County of Tipperary,] where he put them to the dice and hanged five of them.

"One Lieutenant MacGragh, of his Majesty's army, being taken prisoner by Captain John Godfrey, was five days after hanged in the town of Fethered, by Colonel Sankey, notwithstanding the said Godfrey's protection to have given him quarter.

"1652. Seventeen poor women and children, in protection, were murdered at Tullow, by Major Elias Green and his party, and one of the troopers refusing to kill a woman big with child, (by name Elizabeth Cugly,) was wounded by the said Major, who thrust his sword through the woman's bowels.

"Within a while after, thirty women and boys, ready to starve and digging potatoes in their own gardens, in the said village of Tullow, were all killed by order of the said Major Green.

"1649. Captain Cantuel and Captain Fitzgerald, of his Majesty's army, were tied to a tree and shot to death by some officers of Cromwell's army, after quarter given.

"1651. Colonel Richards hanged Edward Mockler, a protected person, and also a woman big with child, saying, he did it lest she should be delivered of a traitor.

"1651. Morish English, a gentleman in protection, was dragged out of his house by the said Captain John Godfrey, and brought to Cahirr, where he was hanged the next day.

"1651. Sixteen soldiers of his Majesty's army taken prisoners by Colonel Abbot's troops, near Nenagh, were all killed by them, after quarter given.

"1651. One Moran, a soldier, after quarter promised, was, by Colonel Abbot's command, hanged three hours by the heels from the battlements of the Castle of Nenagh, and next day hanged by the neck till he died.

"1651. Some of Abbot's troops having brought a laborer out of Mr. Grace of Clog Priory, his house, to show them the way, cut off his head within a musket-shot to the house.

"In the year 1650, David Walsh, Esq., about eighty years old, was murdered by Major Morgan, now Sir Anthony Morgan, in the road between Clonmell and Waterford; and one of the said David's daughters, endeavoring to preserve her father, was murdered over him, and a grand-child, of the said David's, of seven years of age, then in the company, was murdered by the said Sir Anthony's own hands.

"No less than five hundred poor laborers and women were hanged at Clonmel and other garrisons in this County, [Tipperary,] guilty of no other crime, but being found within the imaginary lines drawn by the Governors of the several garrisons in the said County.

"A woman, big with child, having, in presence of all the people, the child stirring in her womb, was hanged by Colonel Richards, at Clonmell.

"1651. Sir Hardress Waller and Colonel Ingoldsby, commanding two parties into the barrony of Bueren, (in the County of Clare,) then under protection, killed in one day upwards of eight hundred men, women and children, and meeting with Squire Donogh O'Bryan, an aged gentleman, and protected by the said Waller, they locked him up in a country-house, to which they set fire and burnt him to death.

"1651. The said Colonel's troop of dragoons murdered, in the town of Quenne, thirty aged persons.

"1651. The said Ingoldsby, after giving quarter to nine soldiers of his Majesty's army, and a week's imprisonment, hanged them.

"1651. The said Ingoldsby's men killed about a thousand poor laborers, women and children, in the baronies of Corckromroe, and Inchiquin, being all under his protection. Captain Puerefoy, and other officers commanded by the said Ingoldsby, murdered upwards of a hundred men, women and children, in the baronies of Bunratty and Tullagh, protected by the said Colonel.

"Captain Stafe and Captain Apers, under the command of the said Ingoldsby, murdered no less than five hundred families in protection, in the baronies of Island, F. Bracklane, Cluandarala, and Moysarta.

"1651. The said Ingoldsby's men, when they were surfeited of killing, made it an ordinary practice to bridle the poor people, men and women, to tie them to their horses tails like beasts, and sell them to the Barbadoes.

"Anno 1651. The said Colonel Ingoldsby, being one day with the party in the territory of Clearish, slaughtered upwards of five hundred of men, women and children, all under his protection.

"1651. The said Ingoldsby and his dragoons, murdered in one day, about three hundred protected persons, in the Territory of Tullagh-Hill.

"1653. The inhabitants of the barony of Dunkueren, being ordered by Lieutenant Colonel Nelson, then Governor of the County for Cromwell, to remove with their goods and cattle, for their greater security, were met by the said Nelson, Major Peppard, Captain Thomas Barrington, Captain Hasset, and other officers, with a party of horse, and under color to secure their removal, and, upon a sudden, upon a sign given, the soldiers fell upon the poor people, and killed upwards of three hundred men, women and children. The cruelty of Barrington and Hasset, in that massacre, was remarkable, causing many women to be shame-

fully stripped naked, and afterwards most inhumanly butchered, the fingers of such as wore rings to be cut off, and the babes and infants to be tossed on pikes and halberts, in sight of their dying parents.

"1653. The said Nelson having granted his protection under hand and seal, to Tecig Morcarty, and Conor MacDonagh, Catholic Priests, until their transportation for Flanders, by a time limited; before half that time was expired, apprehended the said Priests and hanged them with their protection in their hands.

"Many hundreds of the poor people of that County, reduced by the exaction and cruelty of their Governors, to a starving condition, were, by Nelson's order for smelling of horse-flesh, which they were necessitated to eat or starve, hanged.

"1653. Captain Thomas Barrington, aforesaid, caused the arm of a poor woman to be cut off with a hatchet, and perceiving that she grasped with her other hand a sucking babe, she had at her breast, he caused that arm also to be cut off, and the infant's head dashed against a rock in her presence.

"The said Barrington caused a Lieutenant and some soldiers of his Majesty's army, taken prisoners upon quarter, to be stripped naked, and their brains knocked out with a hatchet.

"Anno 50. At Shiell, (the County of Cork,) there were forty laborers, with women and children, put on the edge of a great clift, over the sea, a rope being drawn about them, with six soldiers on each end, and so* thrown into the sea and drowned. This was done by Major Wallis, and his party, who, about the same time, murdered in the west of Carbery, upwards of eight hundred men, women and children.

"Anno 51. Charles MacCarty, of Killmydy, being in a party with Colonel Phayre, at the grate of his castle, Colonel Ingoldsby rides up to the grate, with a span'd pistol, and shot him dead; at which action the said Phayre was much dissatisfied, being Commander in chief of that party.

"Such (to use Mr. Neal's expression, p. 6) were the laurels which that hero, Cromwell, gained; who (I will add) acted more villainies in his time, than any age or history can parallel. Nay, such were the mercies of these *fanatical* miscreants, Cromwell's† officers and soldiers,

---

* "Captain Swanley, an *English* rebel, was so barbarous upon taking a ship, in which the Marquis of Ormonde had sent Captain Anthony Willoughby, with one hundred and fifty men, which had formerly served in the Fort of Galloway, from thence to Bristol. 'The ship, which carried them, was taken by Captain Swanley, who was so inhuman as to throw seventy of the soldiers overboard, under pretence that they were Irish, though they had faithfully served his Majesty against the rebels, during all the time of the war.'—*Carte's Life of the Duke of Ormonde.* Vol. I, p. 481."

"† These wretches, most of them, sprung from the refuse of the people, and as the writer of a tract entitled Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter-House, p. 32, observes, 'If there had been an agreement made between the King and the two Houses, these buff-grandees and proud officers, must have returned to their needles, their hammers, their lasts, their slings, their carts, and their flails.'

"Nay, such blood-thirsty wretches were these pretended saints of the army, that soon after the King's death, 'It was debated at the Council of War, (Walker's History of Independency, Part II, p. 130, from Mr. Sedgwick's

(who on Mr. Neal's account, were under so severe a discipline, that not an oath was to be heard through the whole camp, but the soldiers spent their leisure hours in * reading the Bible, and † singing of Psalms and religious Conferences,) that notwithstanding all their hypocritical sanctity, murder (with various other‡ crimes) was discarded from their catalogue of sins. For they committed such, as even the barbarous Spaniards, who murdered so many innocent Indians, unprovoked, would have blushed at; and were not to be paralleled in any other age or nation. Nor was any thing more common with the rebels, than to decry the Irish as Papists, though their attachment was never so great to the Protestant religion."

Justice upon the Army's Remonstrance,) 'to massacre and put to the sword, all the King's party; the question put, was carried in the negative but by two voices.' And elsewhere (History of Independency, Part III, p. 11) he informs us, 'That their endeavor was how to diminish the number of their opposites, royalists and presbyterians, by a massacre, for which purpose many dark lanthorns and poniards were provided last winter, 1649. But fame prevented this plot; which, coming to be the common rumor of the town, put them in mind of the danger, infamy, and hatred that would overwhelm them; so this was laid aside.'"

"* Dr. South observes, (Sermons, Vol. V, p. 33,) 'That amongst the seraphical illuminati, and the highest Puritan perfectionists, you should find people of fifty, threescore, or fourscore years old, not able to give that account of their faith, which you might have had heretofore from a boy of nine or ten."

"† Dr. Richard Watson, (Notes upon Bishop Cousin's, opinion for communicating rather with Geneva than Rome, 1684, p. 48, *penes me*,) 'mentions some of the improper uses they made of Psalms, as at their city feasts (in the place of more artificial music)—and as an hypocritical property to gain the reputation of piety, in the strict observance of family duties, as they call them, whereof some of their own children have taken notice, as did the boy, who, being reproached by his playfellow, that they sung no Psalms, on the Sabbath days in the evenings, as his father and the rest did at their house, received this answer, with too much truth, as the young gamester ingeniously meant it, 'That the reason why at his father's house no Psalms were wont to be sung was, because they had no window towards the street.'"

"‡So many crimes were those hypocritical cut-throats guilty of, that the cavalier soldiers are not to be brought in comparison with them in any other way, than that of Peggy and the three Sisters in the Fable, (L'Estrange's Fables, Vol. II, Fab. 87, p. 86,) 'Peggy was such a precedent for sanctity, that her mother would be twitting the other three every day with their sister Peggy. Now this same sister Peggy of theirs was a notable revelation girl, and never without Heaven and heavenly things in the mouth of her, though they never came near her heart; a Friday-face for every day in the week, a short-hand book still at her girdle, and, a crums of comfort at her bed's-head. The very thoughts of a play-house, or a dancing-bout, would put her into fits. She dreaded the inside of a Popish Chapel more than all the woes of the Gospel; and her closet devotions were heard further than a Proclamation. As for the other sisters, they lived civilly and sociably all this while in the innocent enjoyments of the lawful comforts of life; but without the least color of scandal, or offense to conscience, honor, or good manners. But this did not hinder the mother with hitting the girls in the teeth with these honest liberties; yes, yes, she'd cry, you are like to be hopeful birds, when will you renounce the world, I wonder, as your sister Peggy has done? Oh, never fear us, good madam, cried the wenches, but by that time we know as much of the world as sister Peggy, we shall think every jot as ill on't as she does.' Now poor Peggy had had already two bastards, &c."

The celebrated Richard Baxter, pretty good Puritan authority, bears witness to the *state of Religion* under the Puritan dynasty, in the following testimony:

"* 'What shall I tell you (says he) of all those hideous pamphlets against ordinances, and for the mortality of the soul, and that the soul is God himself, and against the truth of the Scripture, as downright familism, and libertinism, and paganism. I cannot but think how men cried out against Mr. Edward's Gangræna at first, as if he had spoken nothing but lies, and now they have justified it with a fearful overplus.' And yet Mr. Edwards took the liberty of expressing himself in the following manner:

"Gangræna, Ep. Dedicat. 'We are fallen to madness (says Mr. Edwards, Gangræna, Book I, Part 3, p. 75) and folly, that I am persuaded, that if the Devil came visibly among many, and held out independency and liberty of conscience, and should preach never such false doctrines, as that there were no Devils, no Hell, no sin at all, but these were only men's imaginations, with several other doctrines, he would be cried up, followed, and admired. And again, (p. 80,) We are insensible and not affected, under all the spiritual plagues of heresy, schism, blasphemy, intolerable anarchy; the fortieth part of these errors, heresies, blasphemies, which are now in the midst of us, would, seven years ago, have made our hearts ache, and our hair stand on end, filled our faces with paleness and blackness, whereas now we make light of them.

"Our evils, (says he,) are not removed or cured, but only changed; one disease and devil hath left us, and another as bad is come in its room. Yea, this last extreme is far more high, violent and dangerous in many respects. Have we not worse things come upon us than ever we had before? Were any of these monsters heard of heretofore which are now common amongst us? As denying the scriptures, pleading for a toleration of all religions and worship, yea, of blaspheming, and denying there is a God. You have put down the Book of Common Prayer, and there are many amongst us who have put down the Scriptures, slighting them, yea, blaspheming them. You have broken down the images of the Trinity, Christ, Virgin Mary, Apostles; and we have those who overthrow the doctrine of the Trinity, oppose the Divinity of Christ, speak evil of the Virgin Mary, and slight the Apostles. You have cast out the Bishops and their officers, and we have many that cast to the ground all Ministers in the reformed Churches. You have cast out ceremonies in the Sacraments, as the Cross, kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and we have many that have cast out the Sacraments of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. You have put down Saints days, and we have many that make nothing at all of the Lord's-day, and Fast-days. You have taken away the superfluous, excessive maintenance of Bishops and Deans; and we have many who take away and cry down the necessary maintenance of Ministers. In the Bishops days we had the

---

"* Baxter's Plain Proof of Infants Church Membership, p. 147."

singing of Psalms taken away in some places, conceived prayer and preaching; and in their room Anthems, stinted forms, and reading brought in, and now we have singing of Psalms spoken against, and cast out of some Churches, yea, all public prayer questioned, and all ministerial preaching denied. In the Bishops days we had many unlearned Ministers, and have we not now a company of Jeroboam's Priests? In the Bishops days we had the fourth Commandment taken away, but now we have all the ten Commandments taken away at once by the Antinomians, yea, all Faith and Gospel denied. The worst of the Prelates, in the midst of many Arminian tenets, and popish innovations, held many sound doctrines, and had many commendable practices; yea, the very Papists hold and keep to many Articles of Faith and Truths of God, have some order amongst them, encourage learning, have certain fixed principles of truth, with practices of devotion and good works; but many of the sects and sectaries, in our days, deny all principles of religion, are enemies to all holy duties, order and learning, overthrowing all."

To show how these "patient," "self-forgetting" Puritans, "who came into the world to save it from despotism, and the world comprehended them not"—we say to show how they regarded consecrated and sacred places, and what their views were of the connection between "Taste and Religion," we give next their horrible sacrilegious treatment of one or two of the old Churches and Cathedrals of the English Church.

The moderate Bishop Hall, thus describes their desecration of the noble old Church of Norwich:

"* It is no other than tragical to relate the carriage of that furious sacrilege, whereof our eyes and ears were the sad witnesses, under the authority and presence of Linsey, [an Alderman,] and Tosts the Sheriff, and Greenwood. Lord, what work was here, what clattering of glasses, what beating down of walls, what tearing up of monuments and pulling down of seats, what wresting out of irons and brass from the windows and graves! what defacing of arms, what demolishing of curious stone work, that had not any representation in the world, but only of the cost of the founder, and skill of the mason! What tooting and piping upon the destroyed organ pipes, and what a hideous triumph on the market-day before all the country, when in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession, all the organ pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices, together with the leaden cross, which had newly been sawn down from over the green-yard pulpit, and the service books and singing books that could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market-place! A lewd wretch, walking before the train in his cope trailing in the dirt, with a service-book in his hand, imitating an impious scorn, the tune, and usurping the words of the Litany used formerly in the Church."

"* Bishop Hall's Hard Measure, p. 62."

Heylin, in his History of the Presbyterians, p. 453, thus describes the profanation of the old Abbey Church of Westminster:

"* That some soldiers of Weshborne and Caywood's companies, were quartered in the Abbey Church, (as the rest of our modern reformers,) they broke down the rail about the altar, and burnt it in the place where it stood; they broke down the organ, and pawned the pipes at several ale-houses for pots of ale; they put on some of the singing men's surplesses, and in contempt of the canonical habits, ran up and down the Church; he that wore the surpless was the hare, the rest were the hounds. To show their Christian liberty, in the use of things, and that all consecration, or hallowing of things under the Gospel, is but a Jewish, or Popish superstition, and that they are no longer to be accounted holy, than that holy use to which they serve, shall, by the actual use, only impart a transient holiness to them, they set forms about the Communion Table, there they eat and there they drink ale, and tobacco; some of their own Levites (if my intelligence deceive me not,) bearing them company, and countenancing so beastly a profanation. Nor was this done once, to vindicate their Christian liberty, as they call profanation itself, but the whole time of their abode there, they made it their common table, on which they usually dined and supped, though Saint Paul calls it despising the Church of Christ, and asks his Corinthians if they had not houses to eat and drink in? [1 Cor. xi.] They did the easements of nature, and laid their excrements about the altar, and in most places of the Church. An abomination which God did provide against by a peculiar prohibition in the law of Moses, and that, in places not rendered so dreadful by so peculiar a manner of the presence of God, as in the hallowed temples of his public worship.

"Nay, which is the height of all impiety, they familiarly kept their whores in the Church, and which I tremble to write, (prodigious monsters as they are,) lay with them on the very altar itself, and did, in that place, commit such things as are unfit to be done by Christians.

"Two remarkable instances more I will take the liberty of adding, one is of the Church of Litchfield, where † the soldiers exercised the like barbarities as were done at Worcester, in demolishing all the monuments, pulling down the curious carved-work, battering in pieces the costly windows, and destroying the evidences and records belonging to that Church. Which being done, they stabled their horses in the body of it, kept courts of guard in the cross isles, broke up the pavement, polluted the quire with their excrements; every day hunted a cat with hounds throughout the Church, delighting themselves in the echo from the goodly vaulted roof; and to add to their wickedness, brought a calf into it, wrapt in linen; carried it to the font, sprinkled it with water, and gave it a name, in scorn and derision of that holy sacrament of Baptism. The other instance is of the Church of Chichester.

"* Mercur. Rustic. Part II, p. 154. Heylin's History of the Presbyterians, p. 453. See likewise Dugdale's Short View of the Troubles, p. 562."

"† Short View of the Troubles in England, p. 559."

"* By Waller's taking it (says Dr. Heylin) the town got little, and the Church lost more; for upon Innocent's day, the soldiers forcibly broke into it, where they seized upon the vestments and ornaments of the Church, together with the consecrated plate serving for the Altar, not leaving so much as a cushion for the Pulpit, or a chalice for the blessed Sacrament. But this rich spoil being committed by the Marshall and other officers, the rest was left unto the hands and weapons of the common soldiers, who, with their pole-axes did not only break down the organs, but cut in pieces the Communion table with the rail before it. They defaced the two tables of the law at the east end of the quire, for fear they should rise up against them in the day of Judgment; most miserably made havoc of that Church's foundation, which they found on the one side of the south cross-isle portrayed in artificial manner, with the statues of the Kings of England, and coming to the portraiture of King Edward the sixth, they picked out his eyes, saying, in scorn, that all the mischief came from him in establishing the Book of Common Prayer. Which, that it might not be officiated as in former times, they broke open all the chests and cupboards, in which the quire-men had laid up their singing-books, Common-Prayer-Books, gowns and surplices, strewing the pavements of the Church with the leaves of the books, but turning the gowns and surplices into ready money. To all which acts of sacrilegious spoil and rapine, as Waller gave some countenance by his personal presence, and in that somewhat worse than Nero, as the story tells us; so Hazlerig gave much more by his voice and actions; for forcing his way into the chapter-house, he did not only command the soldiers to break down the wainscot, but seized on all the rich plate that belonged to the Church. And when it was desired they would leave one chalice only for the use of the Sacrament; answer was most profanely made by one of the Scots, (of which nation the two Houses had employed too many,) that they might serve the turn with a wooden-dish."

As a specimen of the manner and spirit in which these meek and modest, these "patient," "self-forgetting" Puritans assailed the Clergy and the Services of the English Church, we give a short extract from a book published by one of their party, the famous Dr. Bastwick:

"† If we look, says he, upon the lives, actions, and manners of the Priests and Prelates of this age, and see their pride, fast, impudence, profaneness, unmercifulness, ungodliness, &c., one would think that hell was broke loose; and that the devils in surplices, in hoods, in copes, in rochets, and in four square cow—— upon their heads, had come amongst us, and had be—— us all! Pho, how they stink! The Priests are *secundum ordinem diaboli*, a generation of vipers, proud, ungrateful, illiterate asses; the Church is as full of ceremonies, as a dog

"* History of the Presbyterians, B 13, p. 451."
"† Nalson's Collections, Vol. I, p. 102."

is full of fleas, the Divine Service is a devised service, a plaguy deal of porridge.

"At* the name of Jesus, saith the text, every knee shall bow; and the Prelates, in obedience to this command, put their fingers to their four-square cow——, to give him a nod with their heads.

"And again,† 'The Priests and Prelates, and that fraternity, are the very pole-cats, stotes, weazels, and minevers of the Church and state.'"

And to show what sort of "Devotions" they sometimes listened to who had scoffed at our glorious old Liturgy as "a plaguy deal of porridge," we have the following:

"‡ We pray thee, O God, (says one,) not only to destroy Heaven, but all the glory that hath been in the soul of thy people, and create a new Heaven and a new earth, wherein may dwell the immediate ashes of thy own glory; let the keys of our hearts, O Lord, hang at the girdle of our God; O Lord, tie our hands behind us, that we may not cut the throats of our own souls.

"§ Another being at a loss in his prayers, prayed to God to give him some syrup of barberries.

"‖ One Robinson, in his prayer at Southampton, 25th August, 1642, had the following expressions: 'O God, O God, many are the hands that are lift up against us; but there is one God: it is thou thyself, O Father, who dost us more mischief than they all.'

"Mr. Evans, Preacher of St. Clement's, Temple-Bar, expostulated thus with God, (Dugdale, p. 568,) 'O Lord, when wilt thou take a chair, and sit amongst the House of Peers? And when, O God, when I say, wilt thou vote amongst the Honorable House of Commons, who are so zealous of thine honor?'

"And Mr. Vynes, (a noted man in those times, and one of the Ministers who prayed with fervency,) in the same Church, said in his prayer, [Dugdale, p. 570,] O Lord, thou hast never given us a victory this long while, for all our frequent fasting; what dost thou mean, O Lord, to fling us in a ditch, and there leave us?'

"Mr. Cradock, Vicar of Nun-Eaton, in Warwickshire, used this expression in his prayer before sermon, Sunday, 1st August, 1647. 'O Lord, do not thou stand a neuter; but take one side, that we may see which it is that is thy cause.' [Dugdale, p. 570.]

"And Mr. Cheshire, a much admired Presbyterian Preacher, had this rhetoric in his pulpit-prayer, [Cheshire's Sermon at St. Paul's, 1642. p. 16.] 'Lord, thou hast been good one year; yea, Lord, thou hast been good to us two years; Lord, thou hast been good to us fourscore years; but, Lord, thou art wanting in one thing.'

"* Second Part of his Litany, p. 23."

"† Third Part of Bastwick's Litany, 1637. p. 1."

"‡ R. Seppen's Preacher's Guard and Guide. Printed by R. Royston, 1664. p. 53. *Penes me.*"

"§ Id. Ibid."

"‖ Sir William Dugdale's short View of the Troubles, p. 568."

"Mr. Strickland, on their Fast-day, 9th of June, 1643, at Southampton, used these words in his prayer: 'O Lord, thine honor is now at stake; for now, O Lord, Antichrist hath drawn his sword against thy Christ, and if our enemies prevail, thou wilt lose thine honor.' [Dugdale, p. 567.]

"And one of their lecturers in Southampton, prayed thus: 'Bless the King, O Lord, mollify his heart, that delighteth in blood; open his eyes, that he may see that the blood of saints is dear in thy sight. He is fallen from faith in thee, and become an enemy to the Church; is it not he that hath sinned, and done evil indeed? but as for these sheep, what have they done? Let thine hand, we pray thee, O Lord our God, be upon him, and on his father's house; but not on thy people, that they should be plagued.' [Dugdale, p. 567.]"

Perhaps we have quoted enough concerning the Puritans for our present purpose. Their cruelty, their Vandalism, their intolerance, the gross irreligion, theoretical and practical, which followed in their train,—these we have cited enough, to prove. We might go on to complete the picture, and to show how, and why, it was that the national heart at last sickened of Puritan rule, how rebellion and faction brought forth their own legitimate fruits and Puritanism showed its own utter impotence to mould the character, meet the wants, and fulfill the destiny of a great nation, so that such a monarch as Charles II was welcomed back, exclaiming, "surely all men are so glad of me, that it is my own fault I returned not long ago;" for in truth, all classes, Puritans and all, sighed for those old institutions which had once made England happy and glorious. Indeed, the primary conception, the very ideal of man, according to the strict Puritan theory, is untrue to man's nature. It is an intense *Egoism.* It recognizes nothing so great as the individual. Everything revolves around the personal pronoun I. And hence it is disintegrating, repelling, fragmentary and chaotic. The Church theory, on the other hand, while it does not lose sight of the individual, yet recognizes the social as the true normal condition of man. It teaches, as a primary truth, the brotherhood of man; and in it a "membership one of another." Now the diverse tendencies of these two theories on Society, the period of history before us fairly illustrates; and, we may add, the condition of society in the United States at the present day is illustrating the same thing more and more. It is no vain boasting, it is the expression of the truest philosophy, the inevitable outworking of principles lying deep in man's nature, that the Church alone can save the United States from the doom with which faction now threatens it. Our most sagacious statesmen have borne witness to the

fact, even if they have ignored the law on which the certainty of that fact is based.

We might go on to show how, when the nation seemed about to be brought again under the Papal yoke by James II, and when that monarch was cajoling successfully with the Puritan party to accomplish his ends, just as Puritans and Papists had conspired together for the overthrow of the English Church in 1558, and as they are conspiring now*—that then it was that Churchmen came to the rescue. Those noble Prelates, Sancroft, Kenn, Lake, Turner, Lloyd, White, and Trelawney, went to the Tower, amidst the mingled cheers and lamentations of all classes for their bold resistance to a measure which had the establishment of Popery as its only object. And then, at that period it was—of lethargy and corruption as her revilers would have it—that from the bosom of the English Church there sprang into existence that first and noblest Missionary organization of Protestant Christendom, which has encircled the earth with its charities, and is now, with its younger sister Society, planting the Cross on the extremest verge of modern discovery and enterprise. At least *twenty-four* Missionary Dioceses and more than *thirty* Missionary Bishops, nearly *four thousand* living missionary teachers, *forty thousand* communicants in Missionary Churches,† numerous Mission Schools and Colleges, and nearly *a million and a half* of money poured annually into her Missionary Treasury,—these attest the vitality and power of the English Church at the present day. We are aware that the religious and political papers of this country, almost without exception, either systematically abuse and vilify her, or fail do her justice. We grant the fact of the most unequal and unjust distribution among her working classes of her vast wealth. We do not forget the drift wood cast of late upon the Roman and Genevan shores, of which the two Mannings are specimens; and yet no intelligent man can fail to see that

---

* Dr. South quotes Coleman, as follows:—"That all the advantages they (the Papists) expected to make was by the help of the Nonconformists, as Presbyterians, Independents, and other sects. Let, says he, all our Separatists and Dissenters know that they are but the Pope's journeymen to carry on his work, and that even they who are the loudest criers against *Popery*, are the surest and most industrious factors for it."

None were noiser in preaching among the Puritans against Episcopacy, and Liturgies, and Surplices, &c. &c., than these Jesuits in disguise. We have full proofs on this point which we propose at some future time to lay before the reader.

† The communicants in the Churches of the Church Missionary Society are reported as about *eighteen thousand*. The Reports of the Venerable Propagation Society are very imperfect, yet from a careful estimate of its last Report the number of Communicants cannot be less than *twenty-one thousand*.

beyond all question her progress is steadily and gloriously onward; and that her prospects were never so bright as now.

And what, on the other hand, let us now ask, have been the fruits of English Dissent? A very large portion of the Baptists, as is well known, have gone over to the ranks of Unitarianism. Recent authority states that out of 258 Presbyterian chaples in England, 235 are avowedly and openly Unitarian. Among the Independents, even of that portion hitherto regarded as nominally orthodox, no one can read the criminations and recriminations at this moment going on in England—no one can see the false ground taken on the most vital doctrines of the Gospel—without endorsing the judgment of a late non-Episcopal writer who confesses, under date of Aug. 7, 1856, that recent events have "sadly shaken public confidence in the evangelicalism of the Nonconformist pulpits of the land." And the Morning Advertiser, (London,) edited by a Dissenter, lately said: "The distinctive doctrines of the Gospel—those which constitute the glory of the Christian system, are ignored among both the Noncomformist bodies to an extent which it is awful to contemplate. The Cross has become an offense, even with those whose avowed mission it is to preach Christ and Him crucified. . . . . A ban is put upon all that is vital in the Gospel. . . . All is cold, heartless, cheerless in their places of worship. Never was evangelical religion in so low a state as it is at the present time in the Nonconformist bodies. . . . A large number of the young men who are studying in Independent and Baptist Colleges are more or less tinctured with neological heresy. They have partaken more or less deeply of German Rationalism."

Such are the palpable and undeniable fruits of that English Puritanism which scoffed like an infidel at "Episcopacy," and "Liturgies," and "bowing at the name of Jesus," and "Surplices," &c., &c., and we may say that the tree is to be known, and ought to be known, by its fruits. And now we ask, where, even at that day to which our modern eulogists point as the golden age of English Puritanism, where was it that the real heart and strength and glory, the bone and sinew, of the English nation, was to be found? With the past before us up to this hour, was it to be found in the old Church of England, or in the ranks of Dissent? We are willing to spread this question till it shall embrace all the elements of national prosperity and glory.

The fragments of history which we have cited above, though familiar to the scholar, are not familiar to the great mass even of intelligent readers. They ought to be diffused by the popu-

ature of the day, until no man who cares for his reputa-
ll dare echo the silly nonsense which has been too long
among us. We take no pleasure in poring over the
of Puritan cruelty, sacrilege, and intolerance. But we
ven by necessity to recall the memory of facts, which
r both studiously concealed and habitually denied; and
then branded as bigots because we will not stultify our-
by joining the popular and unqualified praise of that sys-
ich persecuted our forefathers unto the death. We
he descendants of those men are more tolerant from
and not from necessity; and yet we cannot help saying
ere is a vast deal of as thoroughly bitter hatred of the
now as there was in the days of Pryn and Bastwick,
it lacks somewhat of their vulgarity and coarseness.*
now, in conclusion, one word to the "Memorialists,"
suggestions have so long occupied the attention of the
. Is it not wise to pause a little before important con-
s are made? Are we quite sure that our "pearls" will
trampled upon, and we in turn be rent in twain? We
rget the dividing line between what is human and what
ne in the economy of Christ's Kingdom. We may
, or attempt to change, the whole tone and genius of
urch. We may give up one point after another until there
left worth contending for. We may abandon the old
of the Church, and barter away Christian faith for hu-
pediency, and so forfeit the Divine favor. We may yield,
er another, those venerable walls and bulwarks which
so formidably in the eyes of some Churchmen, and yet
are the chief points of attraction to those outside our pale,
one have the spirit to appreciate our privileges. And
hen? What shall we have gained? We may perchance
e in numbers, though this is doubtful, but not in strength.
ve introduced elements of weakness, restlessness, strife
cord; and if there be an apparent growth, it is yet un-
r and unreliable. Doubtless there are certain changes
practical working of the Church system suited to our
d times. It would be strange if it were not so; yet they
touch one vital part; it is only a better adjustment of
chinery to the conditions of society which is called for.

---

a called "our Church music a bleating of brute beasts; choristers bel-
tenor as if they were oxen; bark a counterpoint like a kennel of dogs;
eble as if they were bulls; and grunt out a bass like a parcel of hogs."
this with those scurrilous pamphlets, of New England orgin, "A Seri-
" &c., and "A Looking Glass for High Churchmen."

But the whole subject is one to be approached only with those rarer virtues, the deepest reverenee, and the highest wisdom, and with the most earnest prayer. A profane hand alone dare touch and tamper with the Ark of God. More faith, more obedience, more self-sacrifice, more taking Christ at His word, and less of self-will and presumption are what the Church now needs. Nor ought we to forget that multitudes without, are even now giving up their prejudices and owning allegiance to that glorious old Reformed Martyr Church of England which has proved herself the conservator of Primitive Truth, and which, we trust, is to be the Palladium of Constitutional Liberty in England and the United States. We think we understand the position which the Puritans of other days occupied; nor ought we to wonder at the tenacity with which their descendants still cling to their hatred. Still time will do its work, and we can afford to wait. We dare trust the future; especially when we see men like Bancroft liberalized by study into a truer Catholicity, and witness the remarkable changes of sentiment and tone which appear in the earlier and later editions of his History. All that we contend for, is, that the record of those stirring and pregnant times to which we have adverted shall be given with unsparing fidelity; and that record we are willing to leave to the verdict of all honest-minded and truth-loving readers.

Art. VI.—THE POSTSCRIPT TO THE MEMORIAL.

THE Rt. Rev. James Hervey Otey, D. D., Bishop of Tennessee, Chairman of a Commission of Bishops, appointed on the Memorial of sundry Presbyters, &c.

REVEREND FATHER IN GOD:—At so late a day in the history your Commission I should not venture to address you, except with the primary purpose of expressing, for myself and others, an earnest desire that your Commission should be continued for a longer time, if not perpetuated. That your Report is already prepared, and your work in some sense complete, I suppose should be taken for granted. But I trust it will not be found inconsistent with any result you may have reached to consider the expediency of a further prosecution of the great subjects to which you have successfully directed the attention of the Church, but which are too important, and as yet too little digested, to be in a shape for legislation. The idea of an early abortive conclusion to beginnings, so promising and so wholesome, I cannot for a moment entertain; and yet, even this might be a result, less deplorable, than hasty and crude attempts at reforms.

Intending to press this appeal in the conclusion of this letter, I shall endeavor to show, in the course of it, that great and momentous matters are now fairly before the Church, as the result, under God, of the appointment of your Commission, the discussion and settlement of which are the work of an age, and not of a moment; and to which hearts, and minds, and souls must elevate themselves by sympathies, and studies, and progressive piety, before they can be competent to the grave task of attempting the improvement of what is now so precious and practically good, and withal so sacred, as the work of our fathers.

If the expression, at the outset, of a spirit so cautious, if not timid, should be judged inconsistent with a deep interest in the Memorial, on which your Commission was raised, allow me to say that such will be found to be the spirit of that *Postscript* to the Memorial, to which alone I am a subscriber, and in coincidence with which, rather than with the Memorial itself, I now venture to address you.

Emboldened by a kind personal invitation from yourself I address, through you, the Commission over which you preside,

the rather late than earlier, because I have felt that the Memorialists themselves had the first right to be heard, and to place their cause fully before the Church. In speaking to a body of Reverend Fathers in God, even upon invitation, I have desired, moreover, to think much upon what I venture to say. It was my hope, too, that another, who had a better right, would undertake to speak a word for us, the signers of the Postscript. Hitherto we have had much from the Memorialists and their opponents. Since no one pre-occupies the place, I beg to say a word for a class who are, strictly speaking, neither of the one nor the other description; a class which I trust may prove the largest in the end, and use their power with the better effect, for the influences which will be made to bear upon them from both extremes.

The signers of the Postscript to the Memorial, at least some of them, were influenced by a desire to see the matters embraced in that document taken up by the House of Bishops in an earnest spirit, but with that superior wisdom and experience which their apostolic gifts and their large acquaintance with the wants of the Church would, of necessity, supply. They felt that the Memorial was the product of deep and pious feeling, and of pure benevolence; and that nothing more illustrative of the divine Constitution of the Church had, for a long time, been presented, than the fact that such a document, instead of being placed before the more popular portion of our great Council in the form of resolutions, or instead of being thrown before the Church at random, in newspaper clamors for reform, was brought with filial reverence, and submitted with humility to the College of our Apostles, expressly for them to improve, develop, and reduce to a form less crude, if they should deem it worthy of the pains. Here was a beautiful instance of the working of conscience in the spirit of the Church! Elsewhere every one's psalm and doctrine must be forced into notice on the strength of individual convictions, but in that body which Christ has organized, and in which we are members one of another, the reformer seeks to be felt only through the organs and channels which have been ordained to healthful functions, and by which the body, according to the effectual working, in the measure of every part, maketh increase of itself in love. Whatever were its faults, I thought, therefore, that it deserved attention. It was evidence in itself of an augmenting interest among the Clergy, in their holy relations to souls, without and within the Church; and it proceeded principally from a brother, whose pure example, and patient energy, and fervent zeal are worthy of imitation; think what we may of the schemes which

charity has inspired, and which he maintains with due subnation to those who are over him in the Lord.

o me, at least, it is a great proof that we the Post-scribers (if ay use the term) were right in our estimate of the Memo- to find your reverend Commission acting in entire coinci- ce with our petition, although not according to the letter of Memorial. In the questions addressed by the Commission- o the clergy at large, we find the impulse of the Memorial, not its aim. "It will be observed," say they, "that most hese questions do not touch the peculiar features of Dr. lenberg's plan, but invoke suggestions as to *the best method ncreasing the efficiency of the Church as it is.*" Happy t be the author of the plan, which thus perishes in its own , if he is able to recognize its vitality in that which rises, the Phœnix, from its ashes!

nd yet much is to be said on the two great points specified ie Memorial itself. The Church has responded, by a gen- awakening, to the questions it starts as to our Ritual Liturgy, and as to our relations to Christians, not in comion with the Church. The former is a question which t naturally revive from time to time; and the latter is one ch I thank God has appeared in due season—for it is imible that any Church, which is truly Apostolic, should long , without such a note of its Catholicity, and such an exhin of conscious responsibility for the sheep of Christ's fold at are dispersed abroad, and for his children, who are in midst of this naughty world."

speak with great deference, but as a son of the Church it to speak, in reply to reverend Fathers in God, who ask questions, when I refer to the recognized principle, that, ie worship of God "different forms and usages may withoffense be allowed, provided the substance of the Faith be entire." Does not this principle, as true and of practical ortance, make it probable that its uses must be brought to l, by great changes, in times and circumstances; and it a living and a healthful Church to be afraid of its oper- ? Whether such changes make it now desirable, and whecircumstances render it expedient, to entertain proposals teration or improvements in our worship is a second ques-

The primary consideration, that there is a happy "mean reen too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness lmitting variations," makes it always lawful to entertain estions, or to hear complaints, and to know why we may y disregard them. I own that, at first, I felt that something it be said in behalf, at least, of *restorations*, and that pos-

sibly a supplement to meet the want of German and Swedish congregations, admitted to one fellowship with us, might even be their due. Besides, our Prayer Book was settled in its present shape, at the close of the Revolution, in circumstances little favorable to a clean, entire, and perfect result. In a learned report, submitted to the Convention of 1844, many errors of oversight, and some of apparently culpable neglect, were exposed with pains-taking fidelity, and an important correction in the Calendar, besides several minor ones in the Service itself, were accepted and ratified by the Church. It is to the honor of the laborious brethren who prepared the Standard Edition of the Prayer Book, that they so scrupulously refrained from exercising the large powers with which they were entrusted, by the confidence of the Church, that they did not venture upon other amendments, not even of some which they reported as purely clerical, or the results of palpable inadvertence! As the consequence, however, bad grammar and glaring absurdities are parts of our Standard, and one of the most inexcusable blemishes has attracted the censure of a famous scholar of the continent of Europe, as unworthy of such a work. Was it unreasonable then, in 1853, that some of our brethren thought the work of 1789 required revision and completeness? In threescore years, virtual centuries have passed over the land. For existing wants, and for the strange relations we bear to the modern population of our country, our fathers could not legislate nor provide. Their one thought was how to separate the American Church from the womb of its mother without strangling in the birth. To us, they left the part of doing, for our times, an equally appropriate work, and the stimulus of their example, to do it well. Are we then unequal to the emergencies of our own day? To reform the Papists, reconcile the Methodists, and incorporate the Swedish Christians, who ought to be one with us, but whose case requires some departure from "stiffness in refusing" Liturgical varieties, this is the task to which we ought to address ourselves. Can we hope to do this, without yielding anything from "Dearly Beloved Brethren" to the last "Amen?"

But while such were the considerations presented to my own mind, by the Memorial itself, I must add, with sorrow, that the *Exposition* which has been subsequently given, of the views of its author, in his own, and other, elaborate writings upon it, have produced an unfavorable reaction, in my own mind, and, I am persuaded, in the minds of others. The bold and sweeping alterations which are proposed, in a system which we have been taught to consider as only less reverend than the Bible itself, and whose

very faults have become sacred from association with the departed worthies who preferred them to any novelties whatsoever, have transformed my caution into fear, and disinclined me to any change in the Prayer Book. I am startled, too, by the language which is employed with regard to extemporaneous worship, which we have heretofore deprecated so earnestly, as Churchmen, as ill-advised and licentious in public worship, but which is now introduced to us as "free prayer," and urged upon us as desirable and edifying! They would sew a new patch upon an old garment, which is easier marred than mended. At a time when among dissenters themselves, the whole heart is sick of this "freedom," such a retrograde movement among the inveterate foes of Puritanism may well amaze the Church, and not less astonish the enemy. If this be "what the Memorialists want" they have asked the scorpion for an egg, and stones instead of bread. I think something is wanted to meet special cases, but for one, I earnestly join with those who invoke your Commission to resist the least tampering with the Prayer Book. It is well that we know what elements are at work among us: we shall learn to be careful, and to make the most of what we possess. But when the very inception of reform comes upon us like the swelling of Jordan, I am not ashamed of my timidity, as to "that letting out of water" to which "the beginning of strife" is likened.

Then as to the work of the Church upon our brethren without the pale of her communion: the one merit of the Memorial seemed to me, its solemn presentation of the great subject, to those whose duty it is to take it up, "the angels of the Churches." The plan suggested in the Memorial appeared to me preposterous, but the spirit in which it was submitted struck me as deserving of all praise. It uttered a bold, and possibly a presumptuous wish, but it asked the Bishops to overrule it if wrong, and to do something better. As the result, we have in your Commission a blessed proof that our Church has the instincts of a mother towards all those who call themselves Christians in the land; that she is not content to deal with sectarians, as herself a sect; but by a holy instinct bares her breasts to the children of Christ, even when they refuse her maternal love. Is not this attitude of tenderness to them, and of holy jealousy for Christ's honor, a note of her real character as a true Church? Is not her instinctive outcry against schism a mark of her identity, as the true mother, like her, who pleaded before Solomon? It may appear that we are before the times, and that few will appreciate this rising before day, and providing for the household. Nay, we may be mocked for our

pains, and derided for our love; but one reproach is forever removed. It can never be said that we have shown no signs of anxiety for Christian Unity, in our corporate character. The time will come when it will do good to the souls of thousands to learn that as early as A. D. 1853, the House of Bishops, of the Anglo-American Church, occupied themselves with holy foresight, in considering the question—"How shall the schisms among Christians, in our country, be healed?" Hereafter, none of those who are separated from her, can reproach her with unconcern, or say, "Where is thy zeal, and thy strength, the sounding of thy bowels, and thy mercies towards me?" While, then, I cannot but deprecate the scheme of the Memorial, I cannot but regard the continued existence of your Commission as all important, in the light of a Commission on the religious state of the nation. It is as a watchman on our walls; it is a witness for Christian unity, which must attract attention, and awaken the dormant conscience of American Christendom. It is perhaps of itself, a sufficient exponent of the realities which demand expression. Without are schisms; within are desires to heal them; further there is little now to be done. Your Commission represents the true state of the case; and, if for no other reason, I trust it will not be dissolved. With a defined position, then, as deprecating any attempt upon the Prayer Book; and as opposed, on principle, to the admission to Holy Orders of any person not a *bona fide* Churchman, subject exclusively to the canonical authority and jurisdiction of his Bishop, may I yet suggest, with profound deference, some things which may be done, in the words of your Commission, "to increase the efficiency of *the Church as it is?*" I shall closely respect the questions you have proposed, though without answering them in catechetical form. It will be my object not to discuss, but rather to state the possible end to which we must arrive in practice; and to show, as I said before, that the work is one, not of the moment, but sufficient to task the noblest faculties, of the best and wisest men of an age, as the work of their lives.

The subject of a Standard Bible underlies the matter of the Prayer Book, for the Lessons of the Calendar require a pure and uncorrupted text, from which the minister is to read. The matter was brought before the Convention of 1853, and is to be revived in that of the current year. The impression became public, owing to the stupidity of newspaper reporters, that we were debating the propriety of a New Version, and not merely thenecessity of a Standard Edition of the authorized English Bible. It was painful to observe that the public prints began

to lament our giving up of what they seemed to consider the Bible of the Protestant sects, and what nobody reminded them is specially our *own*, though we rejoice that, in their consent to share it with us, they too are eating of the "children's bread." A great ignorance of the facts concerning the origin of our Version was betrayed by newspaper critics, and others, at the time. Its character as a *growth*, rather than a manufactured work, was entirely overlooked. The fact that the labors of Wyclif, and of those who compiled "the Bishop's Bible," are as conspicuous in it, as the final work of revision under King James, was not thought of. Those who are ever ready when it works her woe, to identify the King of England with the Church, over whose temporalities he presides, were slow to perceive in this instance, that the patronage of King James, in no wise rendered the work any less the work of the Church of England. Nor did any one think it worth while to remark that if ever the *Regale* of England realized its theoretical position towards the Church, it was at this epoch chiefly. Nor was it remembered that it was undertaken as a labor of love; an effort to conciliate; a concession to almost the only complaint of the Nonconformists, at the Hampton Court Conference, which did not disgrace their cause. In short, the amount of popular ignorance disclosed, in consequence of the little debate on this subject which occurred in 1853, was such that it forcibly impressed upon my mind a fresh sense of our duty, as a Church, with respect to the English Bible. We are the hereditary guardians, in America, of the integrity of that golden Version with which our Anglican Mother has enriched the treasury of the universe. Let the daughter of her who has identified it with the thought and the language of the Anglo-Saxon race, assert her natural right to be its keeper and protector! I blush to say, however, that this great dignity of our Church, is one, which some who minister at her altars have so little regarded that they see no evil in transferring it to an irresponsible association of Sectarians. It was even whispered that the Convention of 1856 would actually adopt as "the Standard," one of the editions of the (so-called) "American Bible Society." Now, without any disrespect to that association, except as it is thus set up in rivalry of a divine "keeper and witness of Holy Writ," I beg leave to suggest the surprise and alarm with which the very idea should be viewed, by all whose fidelity to Christs, makes them jealous of the safe keeping of the oracles of God. In the first place, it is notorious, that among those whose influence, and whose money are sought by the Association in question, the "Evangelical" dissenters are by no

means the only parties. Can they be faithful witnesses and keepers of Christ's gifts to his Church, who consent to take bribes from the revilers of His divinity and atonement? In the next place, I have carefully examined the proposed "Standard," and say, deliberately, that while its lack of the Apocrypha renders it out of the question as a Lectionary, it is open to very serious objections, on graver considerations. It is no longer the English Version, at all; but has been made confessedly an American Version, and one claiming superiority as such. The professed improvements in the text are, indeed, comparatively few, and may be regarded as slight; but they vitiate the book, as a genuine English Bible, and introduce a principle which if carried further, would destroy it entirely. I cheerfully grant that the liberties which have been taken, are, in some instances, justifiable on critical grounds, but when a Society whose endowments were received on a compact to print and publish a recognized work, becomes a Society for criticizing and reëditing and improving that work, it is our business to beware of it, and to ask the question whether such depositaries of a worldly trust, are safe guardians of the sacred Oracles. I do not mean to speak disrespectfully of any of the noble philanthropists who have given their confidence, and their wealth, to the Institution in question, but I say further, that the secret managers of the Institution, whoever they may be, are very greatly to be blamed for their abuse of the confidence so blindly reposed in them. While professing to give our countrymen the English Bible, "without note or comment," they have, in fact, become commentators in a dangerous form, and have corrupted the work they profess to publish, by the introduction of unauthorized *headings*, of which some are grossly unevangelical, while others are virtually anti-Christian. This assertion I am prepared to sustain more fully, as I have often done among my friends and parishioners to their amazement and consternation. I now call attention to the fact, merely in connection with the subject in hand, as immediately concerning ourselves. Happily, the healthful apprehensions of the public at large have been excited by the bursting of the "New Version" bubble among the Anabaptists. The incompetency of voluntary and sectarian bodies, to the task of "witnesses and keepers of Holy Writ," has received a fresh demonstration; and the importance of this function of the Church, to her own character and work in the world, must be strikingly apparent. Suffer me then to hope that our Bishops, at any rate, will never surrender it to the keeping of strange hands. To the Ark of the Covenant, and to the Jewish Church, were

first "*committed* the oracles of GOD." Such was the chief distinction and advantage of the Hebrew, according to St. Paul. Shall we forfeit such an advantage, as sons of faithful Abraham, under the Gospel, and betray our trust to irresponsible men? I do not suppose it will be done. I write in the hope that it may be possible to avert a repetition of the attempt. We owe it to the Church of England to await her action in this her own work; and while I trust she will yet enrich *the margin*, with new and critical readings, *which it may be permitted to the reader to prefer in Divine service*, I pray GOD that even she may never alter the venerable text, the undefiled English, the majestic dignity, the virgin purity, and the unparalleled beauty of her incomparable Version of the HOLY BIBLE.

With respect to the Prayer Book, much good has already followed the inquiries of your Commission, by the close investigation of existing liberties, to which it has led. The restoration of Morning Prayer, Litany, Eucharist, and "Evensong," to their appropriate offices and hours of the day, has been found to diminish some of the evils complained of; while for a Missionary Service, the simple Ante-Communion—introducing the attendant to decalogue, creed, and Lord's Prayer, and giving him a portion of the Gospel, and a portion of the Epistles, with prayers, all in the space of ten minutes—has been discovered to fulfill every purpose, in four cases out of five, as preliminary to a Missionary Sermon, accompanied with singing, and the use of proper prayers at the close.

But, without other legislation on a subject so differently viewed, not only by individuals, but by whole dioceses, cannot all that is requisite be effected, "by allowing the authorities of each diocese larger liberty," within given restrictions? Such is one of your own questions, and it seems to me placing the thing where it ought to rest. It is restoring to the Episcopate of the several Dioceses a right once recognized as belonging to a Christian Bishop from the very nature of his office. St. Paul seems to devolve upon Timothy the *framing* of prayers for his own diocese; for such is the force of the original, ποιεῖσθαι, which is the word for the poetical framing of verses. But, over and above this, and without touching the Prayer Book, there is a legitimate method of supplying our acknowledged wants.

We need a *Primer* supplementary to the Prayer Book, and the old Primers of Henry and Elizabeth may not only afford us the name, and the precedent, but also many of the prayers and Offices. Of course, they would require new-modeling;

in fact an adaptation, in every respect, to our times, even as they were originally adapted to theirs. In them might be collected approved Prayers and Collects from standard divines and ancient Liturgies. How vast an augmentation of our devotional wealth, might thus be made, with no detriment to our existing treasures? There, too, it would be fair to introduce such ancient and orthodox Services as Swedish, or other foreign Christians incorporated with our Church, might feel themselves entitled to retain, in the English language. They are said to possess rich stores of old liturgical forms, and they have the same right to love them, as we have to love those which came to us from our fathers. If we are to be simply an English Church in America, we cannot be made to feel this argument; but if we are to do Christ's work in this country, on Apostolic principles, to seek His scattered sheep, and gather them into one fold, under one Shepherd, I cannot see why we should offer less liberal terms to those Christians of another stock, than Rome proposes to Greeks, Armenians, Maronites, and even Anglicans, as a basis of unity with her. Perhaps the Liturgy of Bishop Taylor, composed during the Cromwellian usurpation, when the Prayer Book Service was prohibited, might be inserted for use among Congregations willing to conform to the Church, with such a concession; but this I merely cite as an illustration of what may be done, without departing from actual precedent; in fact, by simply economizing the means with which God's providence has, in various ways, enriched us. And I do not see why the use of these special Services might not be confined to sacred places consecrated as *Chapels*, with the understanding, that on their becoming *Churches* they should employ the Prayer Book, under a *canon of uniformity*, not so stringent, perhaps, as our existing one. The Primer, thus compiled, would be in everybody's hands, for private use, but would be forced upon no one, publicly, to the exclusion of his accustomed worship. It would accompany the missionary as a helper, and assist the pastor as a friend. Its proper contents need not now be discussed in detail, but I trust it might embody, at least in the form of permissible hymns and anthems, those omitted portions of the old Prayer Book, the *Quicunque vult*, the *Magnificat*, and the *Nunc dimittis*, and perhaps, something besides, from the old Edwardine Liturgy, that virginal product of the English Reformation. Of course, different tastes should be met in the Primer, and the large liberty with which the Church endows her children should be nobly illustrated. I trust the compositions of living authors may not be admitted in any pos-

work of the kind, except so far as the collocation, he mere accidents of the work, may require. Even in the language of Scripture, and the use of no other words those of standard writers, ought to be exacted, as far as ble. Let us have no vulgarizing of our formularies. The s of Leighton and of Jeremy Taylor teach us that s Schools among us may satisfy every pious yearning, with- escending to cant, and low familiarities of speech. If care ken with the Primer it may vindicate its name, and an- generation may allow the better portions of the same to ne incorporated with the Prayer Book. Thus there will rash innovation. The American Prayer Book will be a al and healthful growth, and will exhibit to our sons an ple of care and prudence on the part of their fathers, h will act upon them as a caution against yielding to tem- y excitements, or submitting the sacred matter of the c worship of God to fitful changes of fashion:

> Tu cave ne minuas: tu ne majus facias id
> Quod satis esse putat pater, et natura coercet.

God grant, on the one hand, that we may beware of the kery of prescribing for every imagined pain, or ache, in s members of the body; and, on the other, of that cow- anxiety, as to the digestion, which would cheat the spir- appetite of things "new and old," like the fruits of the , each sweet and delicious in its season! When one re- on the exhaustless treasures of devotion, which are irthright of every Catholic Christian, who can but desire s his own Church, in full possession of the choicest gifts of r land and age? Who would cheat his soul of the flowing s in which the noble army of martyrs have witnessed a confession before God and the elect angels; or his tongue y time-honored strain of worship, of which the bare men- makes him exclaim, "awake up my glory, awake lute and p"

ur Commission refers to "Hymns and other Sacred Music." , I suppose, our liberty is very large. Our present nal is but a recent collection, and, whatever may be its s, is hardly worthy of a Church like ours, so competent to ompilation of a book that should be a fitting companion, literary point of view, of the Bible and Prayer Book. The nt House of Bishops, (in fact your own Commission,) dies a variety of taste and talent, entirely competent to oble task of editing a revised Hymnal. Under the Apos- division of Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, al-

most every meritorious sacred ode in the language might find a place, the *psalmary* admitting only felicitous versions of the Psalter; the *hymnary*, only the choicest selections for festivals and fasts; and the *carminary*, indulging the more popular taste with those favorite effusions of healthy piety, which have gained a lasting hold on the affections of the masses. Among these, I should think, might be admitted, for the sake of Swedes and Germans, translations of such of their historic hymns as they would naturally desire. Nor can I see why a castigated version of the *Pange lingua* should not be given us, if we also allow such additions as *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*. Let us have every really good hymn, which the language contains. The Sybilline verses were deemed sacred, by the Fathers, when they spake of Christ; and let us not scruple to claim for the Church all that GOD has forced the wit of man to render as tribute to His glory. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof."

Your Commission directs our attention to the all-important subject of the increase and education of the Ministry. Our Bishops might well assume the tone of command, on this first point, and bid us to see to it, that our congregations should yield them candidates for the laying on of hands. I knew of an esteemed prelate who once amazed an English Bishop by the confession that during an Episcopate of many years, he had actually degraded more persons from the Ministry than he had ever Ordained! Could this possibly have been the case had every clergyman in his diocese regarded it as one of his first duties to labor in the recruiting-service, and to multiply his own ministry by leaving its fruits to posterity in the ministry of others? And in dioceses afflicted with "dry breasts and a miscarrying womb," to a degree so alarming, would it exceed the power already entrusted to our Bishops, if they should set forth supplications to "the Lord of the harvest" to send forth laborers; such supplications to be used with special services and fasts, if not at the ordinary Ember Seasons? Is not GOD giving us this reproach of sterility, in order to teach us Hannah's faith, her resource, and her prayer? Is it not madness to leave the supply of the ministry to the mere chance, as one might almost call it, which regulates that great matter in our day?

But your Commission goes further to the root of the matter, and asks what can be done for boys after they leave the Sunday School; and how we shall secure the larger attendance of young men on the Services? I have no doubt the undue length of our Services, as at present aggregated, is the great secret of the

"weariness" which makes them so distasteful to a certain class of active, and not very devout, young men and lads. But, if the boys of our congregations were only trained to the love of music and singing, and if they were accustomed from the beginning to take their part in swelling the praises of the great congregation, I do not think they would be found to complain of even our conjoint Services as tedious. They are often present merely as spectators, (as prisoners for a couple of hours,) and no wonder they "snuff at it." Besides, boys, after a certain age, regard themselves as exempted from the care of their pastor. Church is for parents and sisters, not for boys and young men. So they appear to think. I should be slow to *recommend* anything on the strength of my own experience, yet I may barely mention that for years I have endeavored to meet this difficult matter, in pastoral work, by inviting lads and young men to a special course of instruction in *Christian Ethics*, calling it, to suit them, "Moral Philosophy." Many will join a class in "Philosophy" of any kind, who would be deterred by false shame from a formal "Bible Class." Meeting the class in an informal way, during winter evenings, and devoting one hour at a time to their instruction, I have used the Book of Proverbs as a text book, and with black-board and chalk, have supplied them with a simple syllabus of subjects. Extending the range of instruction, at their own request, I have often supplied in the same way lectures on the history of the Church, and of the Sacred Canon, and the origin and use of the Prayer Book. Dissolving such classes at the beginning of Lent, I have usually found large numbers of them willing to join another class, for instruction in practical religion, and in preparing for Confirmation. Considerable additions to the communion, and to candidateship for Holy Orders have been the result, ordinarily; and I feel sure that a more efficient carrying out of this plan might secure greater results. I mean that if the pastor who gradually conciliates the regard and interest of young men, by this sort of effort for their good, would carry out his influence in them, (more efficiently than the writer can feel that he has ever done,) by visiting them and receiving visits from them, and taking an interest in their interests, ideas, and prospects, the results under GOD might exceed all we could anticipate. These results cannot be brought about without prayer, self-denial, and labor; but what else are pastors good for, if it be not for labors of love, in such a fertile field as that of the hearts of young men?

As to the present "method of preparing young men for the Ministry." I believe there is a general feeling that it is

greatly defective. As a competent committee of our Bishops and others are now digesting a plan of improvement in the course pursued at our General Seminary, I feel unwilling to enter on a subject so much better fitted to so ripe and learned a body. But is it a sign of disaffection towards a "School of the Prophets," of which I rejoice to be a son, to wish, in all things, her perfection? Is it disloyal to hint that *Alma Mater* is falling behind the times, in her literature, and her practical merits? Is it unfilial to wish that every divine in America might feel the influence of Chelsean Orthodoxy, the might of her genius and learning, and the weight of her judgment in every practical question of religion which agitates the educated mind of the nation? A distinguished writer of the "Mercersburg" School, who concedes the vast prospect of "ultimate success" which now opens to our Church, yet taunts her if not with a lack of ability, yet with a melancholy barrenness, in the field of Theological Literature. It would give me great satisfaction could I point to our Seminary as a refutation of the opprobrium. I do not undervalue the sound learning, and modest worth which have adorned that much misrepresented School of Divinity. I would speak with filial gratitude of the judicious and grave learning of WILSON, the ripe but unobtrusive erudition of TURNER, the chaste scholarship of MOORE, and of the fervid genius which illustrated the chair of Ecclesiastical History in the days when it was filled by WHITTINGHAM. Well and faithfully have all these served GOD, in their vocation, and *in their generation*; but we live in new times and circumstances, and is it too much to be said, that over and above all that the Seminary can boast of the past, or still claim for the present, it requires an infusion of something to fit it for the living age? Are not new Professorships and new men required? A Chair devoted to the study of Modern Languages, and the history of Civilization; a Chair of Physical Science as connected with Theology; a Chair of Clerical Ethics, and a system of bodily drill, vocal training, and instruction in Music; all seem to be demanded by the times; while Sacred Antiquities and Geography, and Biblical Illustration in general, require far more attention than can be given them under existing regulations. And then as to the health and minor morals of the students? May it not, at least, be questioned whether the position of our seminary, in the midst of a large and luxurious city, where everything that surrounds a young man tends to distract his thoughts, and to divert his attention from sober study, is favorable to the pious culture of his soul? It has seemed to me that a system of devotional training is required at the Semin-

ry to balance the purely scientific pursuit of theology, and
iat this might be so distributed through the week, as to afford
ie students a fit opportunity, on Sundays, to act as Readers in
ongregations, or to perform Missionary work as Catechists,
nder the direction of the Bishop. Happy would it be, for
iem, if some soul deeply imbued with the love of Christ
'ould provide them with a Closet Manual, as closely fitted to
ieir most sacred wants, as Bishop Armstrong's devotions are to
parish priest, or the Sacra Privata to a Bishop.* Yet it may
e questioned whether anything short of country air, and seclu-
on from "fashionable churches," can save the common mind
f youth from influences which dwarf the intellect, and pro-
uce effeminacy in constitution, and the manner of the
petit-maître. It is bitterly comical to see the rose-water suc-
essors of St. Stephen, who are sometimes sent forth from our
eminary, to "astonish the natives" of our backwoods! Is
iis the breed of Divines that is needed to contend with the stal-
art sons of Anak, that spring up everywhere in our land
om the dragon's teeth of dissent; or to "fight with beasts," in
ie desperate encounters of the missionary?

Before dismissing this subject of the supply of the Sacred
[inistry, I hope you will forgive me for touching upon an old
ibject—that of a new system of Bishoprics. How can we ex-
ect the scions, if we neglect to plant the roots? Your Right
everend House has, indeed, discouraged the attempt of Clergy
id Laity to begin a new system, and seems hardly inclined
) modify the old; and we are bound to believe that its reasons
re all-sufficient to justify its reluctance. It has been said
iat the division of dioceses is, on many accounts, difficult dur-
ig the life-time of a good Bishop, and becomes not less so—
de vacante—on his demise. I believe this practical difficulty
in be easily met, with very little legislation. The constitution
rescribes the terms on which a diocese may be divided. Let
ie Canons provide that any district of a diocese constitutionally
ualified to be set off, but not yet ready for entire separation,
iay elect a suffragan (approved by the Bishop,) who, during the
fe-time of the diocesan, shall be the same as an assistant
ishop *within that district;* the district becoming a diocese, on
ie demise of the diocesan, or sooner, if desired, and the suf-
agan becoming its Bishop. It will be seen that while Pennsyl-

* The late edition (Oxford) is the only one that gives a just idea of what
shop Wilson's views of his office, really were; and a republication of Hooker's
hiladelphia) "The Pastor in his Closet," by the late Bishop of Grahamstown,
a legacy to the Church, not inferior to the "Sacra Privata."

vania and Virginia might even now be districted in this manner, a gradual change of the constitution, (as to square miles and numerical strength,) might adapt it even to Maryland and Connecticut, and thus supply the land with a truly primitive Episcopate. The new system would grow up under the existing system, and no diocese would suffer violent or premature disruption.

But how vast the business of your Commission is growing, when it enters on the important inquiries as to the tone and standard of our pulpit, and the best means of elevating both: as to the social intercourse of the pastor, and the means by which he can reach the multitudes beyond the pews, whom he sees daily going down to destruction, with no warning from his voice; and as to an increase of Ministers, permanent Deacons, itinerants, studious Divines in the closet, and zealous evangelists in the open air, and all the economy of divers gifts and graces which GOD bestows, and which His Church ought to economize for His glory! I am sure many practical hints on these subjects might be gathered in a practical way, should your venerable body go on to promote the actual experiment, and not merely to gather theories, as to all these particulars. For what hinders the opening of divers pewed Churches in cities, at certain idle hours, and on certain idle days, for purposes of worship and teaching, to congregations free to occupy them at all such times, and gathered by special efforts among the needy or the indifferent? And is any theory needed as to the way of rousing our people to missionary and other benevolent efforts, when it is actually seen that where the pastor really throws himself into such efforts, his people follow him with heart and hand? On the other hand, can any one marvel at the poor and tame results, where Churches are closed all the week, and languid sermons languidly read, after the more languid performance of Divine Service once or twice on Sundays? Where pastors never detail to congregations one missionary fact, or give them other than the most formal notice of a missionary collection? Where the Church's Feasts and Fasts are treated as dead and stale unrealities, and Ember days, and Rogations, and even Advent and Lenten tides, are almost unnoticed, if not practically unknown! Where everything, in a year's round, is so managed as to make the Prayer Book and its system a dead drag on the outgoings of individual piety, instead of a chariot of fire to every soul, giving the Gospel free course to glorify itself? Do not some of our clergy practically demonstrate either ignorance of *the great system* by which they have sworn to regulate their teaching, or else a secret distrust of its power and efficacy? Why

en are they ministers of a Church, whose work they despise? nd is it marvelous that the camp-meeting and the revival ase should divert from us the zeal and fervency of unin-ructed youth, or the energies of rustic and uneducated enthu-sm, when they know nothing, and are taught nothing, of our hurch's real life, by a practical carrying out of what the rayer Book so richly provides? I know that in country stricts, and even in cities, it is hard to draw the people to-ther in considerable numbers; but what prevents the pastor om forestalling the prayer meeting, by visiting the cottage, id there reading the service, accompanied by music and the xposition of the Word? I could name brother ministers who ave tried these experiments with success. None of their locks complain of a want of life in our Prayer Book, or Church stem, or clamor for "free prayer." Neither do they wander strange pastures for food and refreshment.

I know that to carry out an enlarged work of the kind thus nted at, the Ministry itself must become a different thing om what the tendencies of the age are producing. The bit of ulpit-furniture known as a "popular preacher," must disap-ar, and the real bone and sinew of co-workers with Christ, ust be found in its place. What is the cause of the general ntempt into which the Ministry has fallen? Is it not that wyers, doctors, merchants and mechanics, all do their work if they loved it—hand and heart, sweat of the brow, and nell of the lamp, all telling on one end—while too many inisters of the Gospel—and those who occupy some of the ore prominent positions as such, content themselves with the se performance of a bare routine of professional duty, unen-vened by such acts and efforts as are wont to indicate a taste r one's business, in all other pursuits and callings of men?

The other questions of your Commission indicate the unim-oved resources which would be developed among us, should e Ministry, in general, shake off the trammels of precedent, id loose itself from the false requirements and fashions of the mes, and assert its divine mission by practical industry, in the hurch's own way. The permanent Diaconate; the use of y-gifts—lectors, almoners, sponsors, catechists, sisters and others of mercy, Christian educators, (for love rather than oney,) all these will be developed, when the clergy need such d, and call for it. Why should not youth be licensed in very congregation, to assist the pastor, in reading Lessons, and her portions of the service? Why should not men, mature age, of moderate wealth, retiring from worldly pursuits, and ll of practical wisdom, be ordained as Deacons, and made to

feel it the highest of privileges to close a life, blessed by God in other callings, by faithful service in the vocation and ministry of St. Stephen? Oh for a Church thus conforming itself to the pattern of the New Testament, and approving its Apostolic and Catholic power, to the eyes and consciences of men, by such fruits as cannot be gainsayed nor resisted?

I feel that you will pardon the freedom, which the stimulus of your own queries has excited, but, in the profound sense o the kindness which gives me a hearing, I will hasten to an end. Your Commission entertains the important idea of reconciling those whose gifts and graces, as Christian teachers, are lost to the Church and to her holy development. When one sees the eminent talents, and the devoted piety, which apparently nothing but mysterious accidents of birth and education have arrayed against us, in the ministries of hostile bodies, no one can wonder at the inquiry whether terms of time, and conformity, and attainment, may not be relaxed in their favor, with a view to inducing pious ministers, of such bodies, to transfer themselves to the service of the Church? But, who can doubt that a law more relaxed, in these particulars, than our present one, would require the gravest consideration, and comparison of experiences, on the part of our Bishops, before it could be safely entertained? There is a certain *ethos* of taste, instinct, thought, and conscience, which characterizes the ministry of the Church; which ought to characterize it forever; and which nothing can, ordinarily, impart to minds which have received their entire theological cast and stamp under sectarian influences. Can we afford to fill our chief seats with a class of men to whom such an *ethos* is unintelligible? How delicate the inquiries which ought first to be instituted, as to the working of the existing Canons? How multiplied should be the checks and safeguards by which position in our priesthood should still be proof of regular and qualified entrance upon its high functions, without damage from the facility of "climbing up some other way!" For one, I long to see the Diaconate opened to almost any intelligent and godly layman of our communion; but the higher Orders more and more restricted to "well-learned men."

But when your Commission passes to the question as to the reconciling of sectarian bodies, in their corporate form, I thank God to find such a glorious work even touched upon, by such a Council, in such a spirit. I can safely reply that many anecdotes, which I might relate more privately, go to prove that such bodies are, in some parts of the land, moving rapidly towards us, and even beginning to entertain the thought of

ultimate union. Elaborate articles have lately appeared in several Sectarian Reviews which point in this direction, and even while I write, I take up the "Bibliotheca Sacra," and discover, with delight, certain appreciative remarks on the utility and value of the Athanasian Creed, which, I am sorry to say, are far in advance of the sentiment of too many among ourselves. Eminent members of divers religious denominations, more or less orthodox in their profession, have, to the certain knowledge of the writer, expressed themselves as deeply interested in the appointment of your Commission, and anxious as to its results. Others have even displayed a concern for the preservation of our Prayer Book in its integrity, which might furnish a lesson to some of your own Memorialists. Others have said, in so many words, that their views and feelings towards our Church have been led to a great revolution, in view of its advancing vitality, and the decay of their own institutions. In many cases such leanings towards us, are prompted, it may be, by taste and refinement of individual character; but in more, I believe them to be the product of the alarm and sorrow, with which the growing evils of Sectarianism are filling the souls of its more devout and intelligent adherents. I cannot affirm that the vast idea of Catholic Unity seems to have penetrated the minds of many of those whom I have now in view; but a willingness to avoid further divisions, and a readiness to learn of any remedy for the miseries they deplore, leads them sometimes to hint at large concessions which they would be glad to make, for the sake of becoming partakers with us, of the fellowship of the Apostles. When I have reminded such persons of the vast concessions once offered to the Presbyterians of Scotland, by our Episcopate in England, they have eagerly asked whether such things could be done again. When I have related the story of A. D. 1661, and reminded them of the example of the saintly Leighton, they have "marveled because of the unbelief" of the Kirk, which rejected his counsels, and spurned his plea "for a moderate Episcopacy." When I have said to them—'and yet, had his counsels prevailed, England and Scotland would have been of one Communion this day; and Princeton and Chelsea would have taught one theology; and White and Witherspoon would have been founders of one vast American Church; and one glorious missionary work would have gone forth from Britain and America to evangelize the world'—I have, almost uniformly, succeeded in drawing forth a pious ejaculation of regret that such a blessing could not have been transmitted to us, by the wisdom and piety of those, who must

answer to God, as it is, for the perpetuated schisms and consequent heresies, of divers nations, and generations, and languages, and peoples! What an illustration of the fundamental importance of that *Unity*, for which our Great High Priest interceded, as that by which the World might know that He was sent of the Father! Shall the Christians of America ever realize the glory of the Homeric hero, and show themselves "greatly better than their fathers?"

I can fancy drowsy indifference sneering at the idea of one great Church, for one great people, and drawling its contented expressions of satisfaction to leave things as they are! "Give me a cabin-passage to heaven," says one, "and they who like it may take the steerage, or leap into the cock-boat and the tub." "It is vain to think of making Episcopalians of the masses," says another, "it is the religion of refinement and taste." Or again, says one, with an affectation of liberality, "I think we may as well let those who like it, have their way, and be Methodists and Baptists: let us be contented that ours is the better way for us." The answer to all this is—"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, that *they all may be one*,"—who says that? Now if your Right Reverend Commission will but keep it before this Nation, that there are those who use this prayer of Christ's, and mean by it, what they say; and that they do so, believing that Christ is pledged to bless those who thus seek the fulfillment of His own prayer, by enabling them to fulfill it, you are performing a work for which unborn generations shall bless you. Christian charity is contagious. It is a principle of the human heart, in its renewed character, to seek for fellowship with all Saints; and to those who dare to set up the high example of witnessing for the Unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace, Christian hearts will instinctively turn. Who can resist a kindling in the soul, and a tear in the eye, when any earnest believer shows a desire to clasp his hand, and to salute him as a brother? And is it not a gracious thing when a whole Church extends the hand, and shows itself animated by a desire to reunite into one family, "all who profess and call themselves Christians." How gracious the moment when the primate Sancroft was moved to an effort like yours, to reconcile the Dissenters, and when they for a time forgot their hatred of prelacy, and hailed the Seven Bishops, as, in truth, the angels of the Churches! There have been historical epochs when even some among the better few of the Romish Communion have shown themselves penetrated by a Christian principle superior to their formal tenets as Pa-

pists; and what a principle is exhibited in the fact that these blessed inconsistencies have endeared their names to millions in spite of their Popery, and given them a hold upon the homage of mankind! Bossuet was a persecutor when he obeyed the cruel Mistress whom he acknowledged as superior to his own conscience, but even he is admired as the correspondent of Leibnitz, and of Wake, and as the candid eulogist of Bishop Bull. So Fenelon—one almost forgets that he lent his gentle name to the cruelty which revoked the Edict of Nantes, in the recollection of the milder spirit with which he preferred to perform his own mission of conciliation, among the poor peasantry of the Cevennes. One word of Christian charity obliterates the darkest memories of ancient strifes; and he who breathes a prayer of genuine love to all who love His Saviour, has perhaps unconsciously begun the movement which is to herald the glory of the Latter Day, and to prepare the universe for the Coming of the Son of Man.

There are bodies, in the midst of us, from whom if we are to continue longer estranged, we ought to know why it must be so. The Moravians are said to possess a valid Episcopate, and the same is affirmed of the Swedish Christians, who belong to their National Church. Is it not possible that inquiries as to the facts which are said to have satisfied Bishop Wilson, and the primate Potter on the one point; and as to the facts which are said to have been investigated by one of our own Presbyters (a native Swede) on the other, might tend to excite them to similar inquiries as to us? Is it not possible that the wilds of America might see the beginnings of a Mission which might be extended to Europe, through the ministry of Presbyters and Bishops, in full communion with us, returning to their native lands to publish in their own tongues the wonderful works of God? Your Commission, it seems to me, can at least reflect lustre upon the age, by consenting to toil on, even against hope, in collecting facts; in trying wise experiments; comparing historical precedents, with modern problems; keeping alive the spirit of prayer against "our unhappy divisions," and so preparing a happier generation for the blessing of which we are unworthy to conceive as depending possibly upon such slighted efforts of our own. He who inspires the wish, is able, nevertheless, to make us feel it the sufficient encouragement.

I need scarcely say, in conclusion, that these views are humbly submitted, on the supposition that it is only from frank and full discussion, and from the divers contributions of divers minds, that the best results are to be reached. I feel as deeply as any one can, that no single mind is able to

compass the whole subject. All things are double: and on this ground, I rejoice even in those contributions to this movement which seem to me enthusiastic and Utopian. How often God permits the bold reformer to go too far, in order that others may go far enough! I desire to do full justice to the estimable author of the Memorial, under this conviction. I recognize his Mission, but I feel that what may well become the glowing plea of the advocate, would disgrace the charge of a judge, or the verdict of a jury. To the Church, and to the nation, we look for the material of your work, but your Commission is entrusted with the noble task of presiding over the effervescence and the collisions of thought, and of directing all to a glorious conclusion. Unless I overrate the movement itself, it is designed in some degree to do for our country what was done for Europe by the great doctors of the fourth and fifth centuries. In many respects, our country exhibits now the same chaotic turbulence, with which the deluge of immigration from the North, overwhelmed the effete civilization of the Roman Empire. "The mangled limbs of the Old World are once more seething in a Medæa's cauldron, to come forth whole, and young and strong;" and, ours is the fault, if the incantations of the sorceress be not effectually overruled, and the Gospel inaugurated as the genius and regeneratrix of society. Let us assert our calling, and rise to our great work. Even if we fail, we shall succeed in giving our own souls a moral amplification, and in saving them as a prey, from the Sodom that refuses to be purified. Let us look back, for an example, to the great period of which I have spoken, and of which an English brother so forcibly condenses the description, when he says, that "To exhibit the Catholic Church as possessing in *the great facts which she proclaims* full satisfaction even for the most subtile cravings of a diseased age was the work of time, and men were sent to do it, and aided in their labor by the very causes which had produced the intellectual revolution. *The general intermixture of ideas, creeds, and races*, even the mere physical facilities for intercourse between different parts of the empire, helped to give the Christian Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, a *breadth of observation*, a *depth of thought*, a *large-hearted and large-minded patience and tolerance*, such as, we may say boldly, the Church has since beheld but rarely, and the world never. And thus, an age, which to the shallow insight of a sneerer, like Gibbon, seems only a rotting and aimless chaos of sensuality, and anarchy, and fanaticism, and hypocrisy, produced an Athanase and a Jerome, a Chrysostom and an Augustine, and laid, by unconscious agents, the foundation of all European thought and ethics."

I end then, as I began, by an urgent prayer for the continuance of your Commission. I submit that if it was wise to institute, it cannot be time to dissolve it. For one, I became a subscriber to its postscript in the firm belief that the first good of the Memorial would be immediate, but its best results more slow in realization. I thought it would be instant in effecting a division between the dead past and a glorious future; and this it has done, as by Moses' rod cleaving the sea into two parts before the Ark of God. It has infused a fresh and healthful life-blood into the veins of the Church. The miserable disputes and party-lines that existed before 1853 have disappeared, and are obliterated. New thoughts and interests occupy the mind and heart of the earnest, working members of our communion. With all that has been broached, whether crude or passionate, or foreboding and reactionary, it is evident that men's consciences are stirred within them, by a sense of great and absorbing interests which demand investigation and mastery. Under such impressions even sluggish spirits are waking up, and torpid energies are quickening into action. The zealous contribute their impulses; the timid advance with their alarms; the prudent interpose delays; and the truly wise and holy spirit of the Church composes the discordant elements, and educes a blessed result. He who despairs of final good to her sacred cause, must be a sceptic as to the soundness of her organization, or as to the existence of those divine influences which we believe have upheld her for ages. Unless it is a mistake, then, to believe that a great matter is only begun, and unless your Right Reverend House is satisfied that no more is to be gained by the free discussion of the subjects your Commission has opened, I implore that the Commission may not now be closed. If closed, how will it end? Who can maintain that we are already prepared for legislation on these vital concerns? On the other hand, who will propose to let it end in smoke? I do not think such smoke will be without an explosion first. That the movement can now be entirely suppressed, without the development of dangerous reaction must be improbable to every one who considers the lessons of history, or reflects on the operations of the human mind, when excited by religious zeal. Your Commission performs the part of a regulator, to a power which it cannot dissipate: it gives order and direction to the new forces, and, by its very existence, subordinates them to the great system of the Church. If it would avoid a worse than abortive conclusion, let it continue to balance and to check what is precious when thus economized, but ruinous if released from control.

I am convinced, moreover, that your Commission is acting externally to the Church, if only by the bare fact that men recognize it, from without, as a challenge to Unity. It is a sign of something yet to come, and they ask *what it means*, in tones that show they feel what the answer must be. Let them understand that it means simply this, that the Church in America has problems of her own to work out, and a character of her own to assume, to which the traditions and precedents of the Church of England furnish no law. With millions of estranged souls to convince, convert, unite and sanctify; with a solemn debt to "barbarian, Scythian, bond and free;" with the surroundings of a nation, to whose constitution nothing is wanting, but such purifying influences as she alone can bring to bear upon the popular mind, let them begin to feel that your Commission proposes to the Anglo-American Church the simple duty of "lengthening her cords, and strengthening her stakes;" while it proposes nothing more to them than a plea for Christian Unity, on the principles of the Apostolic and Nicene ages. Such be the glorious distinction of our Church in America. "God wills it." She only can proffer such a basis of union, and no other can be imagined as the possible basis of a restored and reunited Christendom.

I have thus addressed you, Reverend Father, I trust with that decorum, in answering your inquiries, which is due to your Apostolic Office, and yet I trust you have not been unwilling to recognize in my arguments, something of the confident tone of a privileged friend, who knows well the heart to which he is speaking. We are not now conferring upon them for the first time. We have remembered Jerusalem in our mirth, and preferred her above our chief joy. Far away, in the academic walks of Oxford, or amid the Scottish Highlands, or again on the blue Lakes of Switzerland, and even beneath the shadows of the Alps of Savoy, these themes, the sacred interests of our country, and the true policy of our Church, excited an enthusiasm superior to all that was called forth by the sublimity and beauty of the scenery. God in the Gospel is indeed far more glorious than God in Nature. With such a heart as yours, it is safe to rest the cause. May no disappointment or regret overcloud our longing expectations that the leaders of our Sacramental Host are prepared to move us onward in the path of a wise and sober progress, towards the great end of providing a Religion for the Republic.

A Presbyter.

Baltimore, (Ember-week,) September, 1856.

Art. VII.—BOOK NOTICES.

Perversion: or, the Causes and Consequences of Infidelity. A Tale for the Times. By Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M. A., Author of "Life and Epistles of St. Paul." New York: Wiley & Halsted. 1856. 12mo. pp. 494. New Haven: S. Babcock.

This "Tale for the Times," though a work of much less importance than the English press led us to suppose, is yet worthy of some attention. Mr. Conybeare's Article on "Church Parties," in a late English Quarterly, attracted considerable notice, mostly on account of its personalities, and its bold positions as to the origin, character, aims and ends of party spirit in the Church of England. He is much better known by his more elaborate work on the Life and Epistles of St. Paul, in which line of pursuit he is more successful than in writing works of fiction. The "Tale" before us has, as a subordinate aim, to show, that while Church Clergymen are wasting their lives in heartless unrealities, or in internecine war, quarreling with each other on points of mere opinion, the world around us is drifting towards Infidelity. The leading object of the work is indicated by its title. It reduces to practice the "Positive Philosophy," the "New Reform," which in various ways is taking such strong hold of the public mind, and of which the *Westminster Review* is now the most prominent organ, but which is also widely scattered in the columns of the *New York Tribune*. "The innocent impulses of nature," and "the impositions of priests," these are its watchwords and its arguments. The book before us reminds us of the Article in the last Church Review on "High Church and Low Church," in which the writer forcibly thus puts the question—

"And while we are contending about matters, which few will dare affirm are vital to our salvation, what is going on around us? While we are defining the operations of Grace in Baptism, and localizing the Divine presence in the Eucharist, what recognition is there of either Sacrament by the great majority of men? While we are philosophizing over the nature of Original Sin, and contending about the diagnosis of depravity, what are the workings of 'actual transgression' in the community? While we are discussing the relative authority of the Church and the Scriptures, what are our young men learning from Strauss, and Hennel, and Newman, and Gregg? The whole tone of modern Literature, scientific, philosophical, ethical, poetical, critical, historical, periodical, clearly shows that there is soon to be a mighty contest, in which the fact of a Supernatural Religion will be the point at issue."

Now God forbid that we should yield to any one in our loyalty to the Church. But we do say that there is a spirit of party among us which is both wicked and suicidal. And it is for this reason that we call the attention of our readers to this "Tale for the Times," by Mr. Conybeare.

The plot of the story is ingeniously laid, yet many of the scenes are badly done, and the principal characters overdrawn. Armstrong, the son of a popular preacher, a youth of strong and vicious propensities, adopts unhesitatingly the infidelity of the Martineau, Comte, Newman and Westminster Review Schools, and, after a career unnaturally conceived, and repulsive to the reader, he at length enters Oxford, where, without being recognized, he meets with his old schoolmate, Charles Bampton, who, with his sister Clara, are the chief heroes of the story. Charles, under the influence of a conceited, dreamy, greasy, smoking German tutor, Gottleib Schrecklich, had already become a skeptic, and now, disgusted with the hollow-hearted pretensions of Tractarians and Evangelicals alike, corrupted in his principles, and staggered by the noisy impudence

and shallow learning of modern infidelity, he becomes an avowed infidel. Clara, too, yields to the same influences, and adopts infidel principles, and marries Armstrong; but a former wife appearing, the unhappy woman coolly determines to end her misery in suicide. Charles is at last saved to Christianity, yet only as by fire. The union of rubrical strictness with sensual liberty, the mercantile morality of Paley's System, the grasping ambition and unprincipled villainy of a sanctimonious hypocrisy, all these sit for their portraits, which are boldly and strikingly, if not always delicately and accurately drawn. That the writer has power to seize and hold the attention cannot be questioned. Thus the utter wretchedness of the victim of infidelity, who has shut the eye of the soul to the glorious truths of Christianity, is depicted in the history of Clara Bampton, and her letter to her brother, after her determination to "shuffle off this mortal coil," is graphically done. She had just been listening to the echoes of her aunt's voice in the "Requiem" of Mozart. She thus writes:

"Alas! what a religion it is that we have lost—the religion of sorrow—the religion of the cross! Yes, I can understand now how it is that the shadow of the cross can turn the Christian's agony into joy. The disciples of a crucified Redeemer drink their Master's cup in felt communion with Him. They thank Him for pain, because it brings them into conformity with His likeness. Their anguish illuminates with a more vivid light the characters of His ineffable love traced upon their souls. The flames which consume them are transformed into a glorious image—the image of a divine companion standing by them in the fire, who is 'like unto the Son of God.' Where such a faith exists—and doubtless it has existed in many Christians, or how could the Church have furnished her glorious army of martyrs?—where it does indeed exist as a reality, I can understand the happiness of suffering; I can comprehend the meaning of that prayer of Keble's:—

'O Lord, my God, do thou thy holy will,
I will lie still;
I will not stir, lest I forsake thine arm,
And break the charm
That lulls me, clinging to my Saviour's breast,
In perfect rest.'

But such a petition is not for me. Such knowledge is too wonderful and excellent for me, I cannot attain unto it. I feel no tendency to be purified by suffering. Alas! no—it only crushes me, and (what is worse) crushes curses out of my heart—curses against my destiny—curses against the government of the world. Yet, as I listen to that strain, a better feeling comes over me. My heart longs to cry out, "Agnus Dei miserere." But a thick black veil of doubt and darkness stretches itself between me and heaven, and blots out the brightness of the sky. O, if there be in this infinite universe an ear to hear me, that ear will surely listen to the half-uttered cry of my broken heart. If there be an infinite love, it will not—*He* will not punish a poor child for running home to Him, even though uncalled. Our mother did not punish you when you came back a truant boy, escaping from the cruelties of school. Surely a heavenly will not be less tender than an earthly parent.

'So runs my dream; but what am I?
An infant crying in the night;
An infant crying for the light,
And with no language but a cry.'

She has stopped singing. The last words of the *Agnus* are still in my ears. '*Dona nobis pacem.*'—'*Dona nobis pacem.*' O, how they are echoed by my heart. The last tones of music which my ears will ever hear—the latest strain of harmony which will linger with me till hearing dies—is that heavenly prayer for peace. O that it may be an omen! *Dona pacem, Dona pacem.* . . . . .
And now it is getting late, and I must cease this lingering farewell, and fold up

y letter. It will have traveled far before morning dawns, but perhaps ot so far as I shall. To-morrow it will have passed through the crash and ar of London, and thence be wafted across the sea; and soon it will be beond the Seine and the Loire. But who can say whether my spirit may not ave outstripped its flight? Perhaps I shall be with you before it, under the adow of the Pyrenees, thrilling you with a mysterious presence, or a kiss of arting love, felt in your heart if not upon your lips. But why do I delay thus ainly? I must slip out across the bridge, and into the silent streets of the litle town, and drop my letter into the post; for I will trust it to no other hand at my own. Then I shall quietly return homewards—yes, to my last home, nd then I shall fall asleep; and then—then 'Fermasi al fin il cuor che balzò anto.' . . . Dearest, dearest brother, farewell, farewell for evermore. hink of me without bitterness—think of me as I was in early days, when we layed together on the shore. Remember that all the happiness of my life I ave owed to you. And if you cannot think of these later months without a ang, yet comfort yourself with the knowledge that all is over now, that the ntleeness of my misery is stilled for ever."

As a work of art this Tale is full of faults. The author sketches well, but he ever finishes a picture. This is emphatically true of his picture of Mormon fe and Oxford life. There is no such masterly delineation of character, no such elicate shading of individualities, as is seen, for example, in "Hawkstone." is leading characters also are often mere caricatures. Neither "Tractarians" or "Evangelicals" are, as a class, quite such fools or rogues as the Rev. Mr. lorgan and the Rev. Mr. Moony are made to represent them. And yet it cannot be denied, that some of the noisiest of both parties are chiefly remarkable r their ill temper, censoriousness, penuriousness, self-will, self-indulgence, and harisaism.

It is as a religious or theological production, however, that this "Tale for the imes" chiefly deserves attention; though there is much less, either of religion r theology, in it than one would anticipate. The External Evidences of Christianity, so called, and the authoritative testimony of the Church, are of ourse thrown into the background. The gross and demoralizing character of odern infidelity is clearly illustrated, and this is the best feature of the book. he great fault of the work is its negativeness. If the Church of England is, ndeed, a quiet and sure resting place for the troubled spirit seeking some refuge om the barrenness of modern speculation, the wretched poverty of an intense, orbid subjectiveism, and the miserable impostures of Rome; if our branch of he Church Catholic thus meets all the soul's wants, capacities, and aspirations, hen why has not Mr. Conybeare made that Church the chief and crowning lory of his picture? He has not done it, and why? Jesuits and Infidels will augh together at his caricature. Let him remember that croaking stolidity, owever noisy, has nothing to boast over zealous partisanship, however narrow. f the author has any loyal attachment to the Church, the reader of this volume ould hardly detect it.

SERMONS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS, written and preached at different places and times during his public ministry of forty-four years. By Rev. ADAM EMPIE, D. D., late Rector of St. James' Church, Richmond, Va. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 511.

The Rev. Dr. Empie has long been known to the Church as a well educated cholar, an earnest, sound divine, a rubrical Churchman, and an Evangelical reacher. According to the old-fashioned notions thirty years since, and before he late mediæval discussions had conceived and brought forth new technicalities, r. Empie, like Ravenscroft, and Hobart, and Seabury, and Johnson, may be alled a "High," but not a "dry" Churchman. That is, he believes in the Threeold Ministry as a divine institution, the Sacraments as Means of Grace, &c., &c., nd at the same time he recognizes and preaches the necessity of a subjective exerimental work of grace in the heart. Certain forms of expression were used

and insisted on by this class of men, which grew out of the controversies of their times, and which we would now modify, or sometimes vary in formal statement; but the great truths which they held and uttered with such earnestness, are as universal and enduring, as the nature of man on the one hand, and the Plan of Salvation on the other. These Sermons of Dr. Empie, prepared for the press since physical disability compelled him to retire from parochial responsibility, will be welcomed by members of the "six congregations" of which he was pastor, and may be read with profit by Churchmen everywhere. For the sake of the Sermons, therefore, as well as of the venerable and excellent Divine himself, we bespeak for them the attention of our readers. They are forty in number, and comprise the more prominent Festivals and Fasts of the Church, and the most distinctive doctrines and duties of our holy religion. They were nearly all written between the years 1811 and 1818, and are published with slight verbal alterations. We do not coincide with every opinion in them, nor would we use every expression which we find there, but yet we do not hesitate to pronounce them sound and excellent.

WAU-BUN: THE "EARLY DAY" IN THE NORTH-WEST. By Mrs. JOHN H. KINZIE, of Chicago. New York: Derby & Jackson. 1856. 8vo. pp. 498.

As we landed at Mackinaw, from the "Buck-Eye State" steamer, on the morning of June 5th, 1856, almost the first man we met was a cabman, with "Mission House Hotel" staring at us from his *chapeau;* and the dingy houses, the lazy, lounging groups of men, women, Indians and dogs which greeted us in our stroll around the island, were in sad contrast with the picture which Mrs. Kinzie draws of the island as she saw it in 1830, when the Mission was prosecuted vigorously, and the island was the busy depot of the valuable Fur trade of the North-West and South-West, concentrated at this beautiful and convenient point. Chicago, too, she describes as it was less than twenty-five years ago, with a mere "handful" of houses clustering around Fort Dearborn, and so lately there the scene of a terrible Indian massacre. It was not until 1836, twenty years ago, that the red men abandoned the ground where Chicago stands for their homes on the Upper Missouri, and yet Chicago now numbers over a hundred thousand inhabitants; and the stranger in that wonderful city might imagine himself elbowing his way through the busy streets of our great commercial metropolis. As an illustration or two of the business of the city, there are sixteen trunk railroads, with thirty-three or four branches centering there as a focus, with from one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and forty trains arriving and departing daily. About twenty million bushels of grain were brought into the city during the last year, and there are single firms doing a business of over twelve hundred thousand dollars annually. Some conception of the magnitude of the business of the West may be formed from the fact, that the commerce of the Great Lakes and Rivers last year was about four hundred millions of dollars, while our whole foreign commerce was only about three hundred and fifty millions of dollars.

The husband of the authoress was Indian Agent at Fort Winnebago, who, with her Father-in-Law, John Kinzie, Esq., will never be forgotten in connection with the history of the Indians in the North-West. Her opportunities, therefore, of studying the native character, habits, &c., &c., of the Indians were most favorable; and in this respect her work is of exceeding interest and value, and will be none the less so a century hence. It is written with exquisite taste, in a style of which any author might be proud; and although it gives the author's personal experience, in which reality and romance are sometimes fearfully blended, yet the story is told with great delicacy and tact; and we part with the authoress as from a true-hearted, noble-minded woman; one as well fitted to adorn the circles of refinement now, as she was to battle heroically with the trials of frontier life when a youthful bride in 1830. May she share abundantly in the best blessings of that Church which she seems never to have forgotten, and of which, in later years, the family have been such efficient supporters.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, in Greek and English; with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary. By Samuel H. Turner, D. D., Professor of Biblical Learning and Interpretation of Scripture in the General Theological Seminary, and of the Hebrew Language and Literature in Columbia College, N. Y. New York: Dana & Co., 381 Broadway. 1856.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians is one of the most instructive and valuable of the writings of the New Testament. At the time of writing it the Apostle's mind seems so filled with the unsearchable riches of God's love in the redemption of man, though his body is restrained by bonds and a prison—so full of his great theme—as to hurry him onward in his discourse, without studied selection of words or arrangement of sentences. Hence the intricate and parenthetical nature of some of the chapters, requiring the most careful reading and study to embrace fully the meaning the writer would convey. But the diligent student of this portion of the Sacred Volume cannot fail to reap a rich reward. In the words of the learned author of this Commentary, "It is not possible carefully to study the Epistle to the Ephesians, without recognizing and feeling the extraordinary character of the Gospel scheme of salvation, the energetic influence of divine truth, when rightly understood and appreciated, and the utter unimportance of everything worldly, in comparison with that acquisition of Christian faith and love which prepares the soul for the enjoyment 'of the inheritance of the saints in light.'"

But when the great and fundamental truths contained in this Epistle are unfolded and explained, with the subtle and acute analysis which characterizes all Professor Turner's works, they become doubly valuable, both to the theological student and the thoughtful Christian.

In the freedom from sectarian bias—the constant aim to get at the "mind of the Spirit," by "making the inspired author of the Epistle and his authoritative compeers the leading directors to the truth,"—with which Professor Turner comes to the examination of the original text, he seems to have acted in the spirit of his own criticism upon those commentators who, having settled upon some particular dogma, can always find some portion of Scripture to confirm it. "Never," says he, "can it be reasonably expected that the Church of Christ will become one in the degree in which it ought to be united, until those whose office and duty it is to expound the truths of the Gospel, come to an examination of the original text of the Bible, divested of sectarian bias, and such prepossessions as spring from imperfect and erroneous education, and enter fully and heartily into the spirit and feeling of the childlike founder of the school of the ancient Hebrew prophets, exhibited in his answer to the divine call, 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.'"

The present work is far superior to any of the previous volumes by the same author, in this, that there is more fullness of detail upon particular points, and in the elucidation of many disputed passages.

The introduction briefly but conclusively disposes of various points, as to the authorship of the Epistle—to whom it was originally addressed—what inscription it bore, or whether it indeed bore any—and like topics, which have given rise to much learned and often useless discussion. Before entering upon the Commentary the reader is presented with a terse and complete statement of the teaching of the Epistle, by a careful analysis and division of the contents into sections. In the Commentary proper, which is conveniently arranged with the Greek and English text at the top of the page, and the notes at the foot, the Fathers and Rabbinical writers are freely referred to, ancient and modern commentators examined, analyzed and quoted, with a fullness and profusion which seem wonderful to one not familiar with the varied and profound learning which, for many years, has illustrated and adorned the Biblical literature of the Church. In supporting his own views he appeals to eminent and judicious critics, within and without our own communion, and while in some cases exposing the unsoundness of the German school, endorses the views of others, which harmonize with his own, with a

candor well calculated to win the confidence of the student. An instance of this appears in the first chapter, where, in explaining the phrase, "Is his body," (p. 86,) as applied to the Church, he quotes with approval the remarks of Eadie; and directly following is an example of the fullness of illustration, and the careful analysis employed in discussing the meaning of πλήρωμα, maintaining that the whole phrase is descriptive of the Church, that "the Church, the body of Christ, is that which is filled up."

The extended criticism (pp. 75–81) is a fair sample of the reasoning of the learned Professor, upon the meaning of the clause, "the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner Stone." He reviews elaborately the theories advanced by various commentators, concluding with this view of the passage as causing the least difficulty in construing the whole sentence, and as most consistent with it, viz, that the Apostle regards "the whole Christian Church under the figure of a building, of which Christ is the Corner Stone, and the Apostles and Prophets the general foundation." In summing up his argument he thus eloquently speaks of this "building," the "holy Catholic Church:" "Such is the Church of God's new creation which the inspired Apostle describes. How sadly has it been marred by the daubings of man's 'untempered mortar;' how its 'living stones' have been defaced, started and moved from their place, broken, and even thrown down, through human agency aided by diabolical hate, is too lamentably exposed in the truthful page of history. But the interpreter must not be turned aside from contemplating the bright and heavenly vision of God's true Church, to the dark, unseemly and disproportioned pile which man's error, prejudice, ignorance and folly may have substituted in its place. The divine temple is one compact, closely joined edifice, every particle of which fits into its right place; and it increases and shall continue to increase, both in extent and character, until it shall become, in all respects, a perfectly holy temple."

The lengthy criticism and notes (p. 113) on St. Paul's quotation of the sixty-eighth Psalm, as also upon the expression, "the lower parts of the earth." (pp. 119–121,) are a dissertation in themselves, to which we can only refer the reader. Upon the eleventh verse of the fourth chapter, the views of the "master spirit of the Church of England," the learned Hooker, are adopted, claiming that neither parity nor diversity of ministerial grades can be predicated on this text; "that we must learn from other parts of Holy Scripture what orders of ecclesiastical persons there ought to be in the Church of Christ."

In regard to the author's view of Baptism, as given, (p. 166,) we should prefer to find greater prominence given to the grace and efficacy of this sacrament. At the same time, we fully endorse the earnestness with which the spiritual significance of this rite is affirmed.

We can only refer to another example of the author's style, (p. 173,) in the illustration of the word μυστήριον, and the refutation of the Romish doctrine of the sacramental character of marriage, which has no other basis than the blunder of the Vulgate translator, in rendering this word *sacrament*. In this connection is presented to the reader, as a "literary curiosity," an analysis of the note of the ingenious, but timid Erasmus.

The late hour at which this book was received, has prevented our giving anything like that careful and exegetical analysis which the merits and profound learning of the work deserve. We have only aimed to present, in a popular and plain manner, enough to justify our own opinion of its invaluable merit as a text book for the student, and for daily reading and meditation in the family circle.

The exposition is accompanied with questions which may be used to advantage by Bible Classes.

We should do injustice to the enterprising publishers of the book, if we failed to notice the mechanical execution of the work. In the typographical beauty of its pages, the excellence and durable style of its binding, in the beauty and clearness of the Greek text, it is seldom equaled by any work in the American market, and will favorably compare with similar productions from abroad.

Yankee Travels through the Island of Cuba, or the Men and Government, the Laws and Customs of Cuba, as Seen by American Eyes. By Domoticus Philalethes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo., pp. 412.

In these times of excitement about Cuba and Cuban Filibusters, all reliable information in regard to this island, which for its fruitful soil and delightful climate, is justly called "The Pearl of the Seas," will be eagerly read. Our acquaintance with this country must be derived mainly from American sources and the works of travelers, for native Cubans are prohibited from imparting this knowledge, on account of the muzzling of the press, and the jealous and narrow minded policy of the government. This volume, consisting of a series of letters, appears from a brief examination to be very full and accurate, and gives a comprehensive view of the social condition of the inhabitants, their manners, customs, laws, and method of administering justice, their religious rites, and many other incidental topics, which to most readers will possess the charm of novelty and freshness.

The fate of the expeditions under Lopez is alluded to in different parts of the work, and the detailed and impartial account of the execution of Crittenden and his companions here narrated, leaves no very favorable impression of the character of General Concha. These unfortunate men, taken on the open sea, after having abandoned the invading corps of Lopez, and completely unarmed, who if they had intended to commit a crime, were deterred in due time from its execution—could not justly, according to our author, be subjected to a military execution. They were nevertheless condemned and shot without trial, in spite of the remonstrances of a prominent bishop and a judge of the superior court, the Captain General seeking rather than avoiding their death, as is plainly intimated, through fear of the Catalonians.

The account given by the author of the Romish clergy corresponds with the statements of tourists in other lands where this religion prevails; and he concludes, that though the character of many of the priests, their manners, conversation, and principles are highly creditable, yet, that "the profligacy of the Cuban Clergy is a fact beyond question, and that there were very few who could be considered exceptions;" that sometimes the priests "failed to attend mass at the hour appointed and kept the whole congregation waiting for them, on account of being engaged in cock-fights," and that many of them are gamblers, and very fond of playing *monte*. Fit Father Confessors truly! Worthy teachers to inculcate the duty of renouncing "the world, the flesh, and the devil!" The faults and defects of the Cubans, as well as the better traits in their character, are related with an evident desire to give the *whole truth*, however unpalatable it may be. We regard this book as well calculated to impart a more thorough knowledge of a country as yet very imperfectly known among us; while, at the same time, the attractive and graceful style in which it is written, will recommend it to perusal.

The Rise and Progress of the English Constitution. By E. S. Creasy, M. A., Barrister-at-law, Professor of History in University College, London, late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Third Edition, revised and with additions. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 359.

The gradual development of the principles of the English Constitution, is illustrated in this volume, by Prof. Creasy, in a very lucid and comprehensive manner. Without referring to political parties, and except in the earlier part of the work avoiding ecclesiastical topics, the object in view is set forth in a way which cannot fail to interest and instruct. The English Constitution, though it cannot be reduced in complete written form, like that of our own, is yet susceptible of full and accurate explanation. Professor Creasy maintains that the principles of this constitution have been in existence ever since the present English nation has had its existence. The foundation of this is Magna Charta or the great Charter, the

Petition of Right and the Bill of Rights—the latter two being the exponents of the former. These three great enactments, he claims, are the superstructure, or, as Lord Chatham says, "The Bible of the English Constitution," which are developed and aided by subsequent charters and statutes confirmatory of them. To illustrate the rise and progress of this Constitution, the author proceeds to analyze and trace the elements, which intermingled, compose the English nation —to wit—the Saxon or Germanic, the chief element, the British or Celtic, whom the Saxon immigrants found upon the soil, the Danes and the Normans, who obtained possession by conquest.

The character, institutions, and laws of these separate races are given, with many historical facts, bringing us down to the time when the prelates, the barons, the gentry and yeomanry, forced the unwilling signature of King John to the Great Charter at Runnymede on the 15th of June, 1215. At this time the nation consisted of not more than two millions of people, of whom probably nearly one-half were in a state of slavery, technically called Villeinage. The other half, the freemen of the land, were divided into the baronial chieftains, with their bands of armed retainers, the landholders of inferior rank, more correctly the yeomanry, and the citizens and burgesses. The text of this great Charter is given with copious notes—its various renewals under Henry III, Edward I, and subsequent kings—the principles of the Constitution traced therein, and its progress and state during the reigns of the Plantaganets, Tudors, and Stuarts, until the expulsion of the latter in 1688, and the accession of William, the Prince of Orange, to the throne. Under this Prince was passed the Bill of Rights, the third great bulwark of English liberty. In 1832, the Reform Bill was enacted, the effect of which has been to increase the political power of the middle classes of the nation.

We have thus endeavored briefly to draw attention to this very valuable work, by an outline of the plan pursued by Professor Creasy in tracing the origin and growth of this Constitution, which at first framed for a population so ill-assorted, has expanded with the expanse of civilization, and, preserving all its primary attributes, has become the Government of the mighty nation, the influence of whose institutions extends to every region of the world. In the well-digested statements of this volume the reader will find an ample illustration of the growth of constitutional liberty, with valuable incidental notices of the social and domestic condition of the English people in the different centuries since the Norman conquest.

THE HUGUENOT EXILES; OR THE TIMES OF LOUIS XIV. A Historical Novel. New York: Harper & Brothers. New Haven: T. H. Pease. 1856. 12mo. pp. 453.

The author of this well managed and well written story is a descendant of a Huguenot refugee; and its object is to portray the persecutions which preceded the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The real character, the persecuting spirit, the fearful atrocities of the Romish Church are drawn without any attempt at exaggeration. The story commences in 1684; the scene is in the province of Languedoc. The family of Lefevre are the principal characters; and after indignities and cruelties of various kinds, at last the principal actors—the parent Lefevre, Gerauld and his wife Eugenia, and Irene the supposed widow —set sail from London to Jamestown, in Virginia, where the Huguenots had obtained a grant of land. For ourselves, we are sick, heartily sick of the loathsome record of crime which is proved upon that corrupt Church; and nothing but her insolence, and arrogance, and corruptions, and intolerance would induce us to recommend such a work as the present, which we do recommend as well worth reading. We wish that these exhibitions of fiendish wickedness were not justified both by the history of Rome and the avowed policy of her most honored doctors. We notice now and then a Southern provincialism in the style of the writer of this volume, like the following, "This woman looked like she might be the mother of martyrs," &c.

Unitarian Principles Confirmed by Trinitarian Testimonies: being Selections from the works of Eminent Theologians, belonging to Orthodox Churches, with introductory and occasional remarks. By John Wilson. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1855. 12mo. pp. 504.

We are really at a loss what to think, or what to say, of this book, of the man who prepared it, or of the "American Unitarian Association" which have endorsed it, and sent it out into the world. We suppose it to be meant as a poultice, or as the quaint old Puritans would say, a 'salve for sore Consciences" for those restless, doubting Unitarians who, at times, are conscious of a yearning after a deeper and truer spiritual life; a necessity of their spiritual nature for something firmer, and on which their trembling steps may be planted. And to silence these inner voices of the soul, as we suppose, we have here marshaled some hundreds of avowed orthodox divines—men who would have cut off their right hand, or gone to the stake, sooner than deny the essential Godhead of their Blessed Saviour—and yet here made to "confirm" by their "testimony," "Unitarian Principles." What will the reader say, when we tell him, that such men as Bishops Beveridge, and Bull, and Blomfield, and Butler, and Burnet, and Gibson, and Hall, and Horsley, and Laud, and Leighton, and Pearson, and Secker, and Sherlock, and Stillingfleet, and Taylor, and Watson, and Warburton, are here quoted as teaching a heresy which their souls abhorred, and which several of them spent their whole lives in combating. After such instances of gross perversion of everything like honest straight-forward truthfulness of statement, we have no right to feel annoyed to see the "Church Review" quoted, as is done on pp. 130, 176, in support of what St. Paul calls a "damnable heresy," and what we truly believe to be such. But in the name of all that is honest and just, we protest against this grievous wrong to the memory of the sainted dead, as well as to the firmest convictions of the living. Let the "Unitarian Association" rob the Second Person of the Ever Blessed Trinity of His honor, if it can, by quibbling criticism on Holy Scripture, and by its assaults on Metaphysical Divinity; but let it pause ere it attempts to prop up its miserable system with such supports as this.

Of course, everything here quoted from orthodox divines bearing upon the subject—and a good deal is quoted which has nothing at all to do with it—is perfectly explained by the fact that they held that "two whole and perfect natures, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man." The leading controversial writers among the Unitarians have been wont to assume the bearing of scholars and gentlemen. The volume before us is unworthy the reputation of either. We should like to give a *catena* of testimony from some of these very men whom Mr. Wilson quotes, showing what they really thought of the denial of Christ's divinity—beginning, for example, with good old Sherlock, who immortalized himself in the "Bangorian Controversy."

Bishop Williams' Convention Sermon, in St. John's Church, Hartford, Ct. June 10, 1856.

This Sermon is the noblest, manliest, heartiest, timeliest production that we have ever seen from the Assistant Bishop of Connecticut. In saying this we say and mean to say, a great deal. In reading it we have been reminded again and again of the Early Churchmen of Connecticut—of Johnson, and Leaming, and Beach, and Mansfield, and Seabury—men who, strangers to such things as policy and expediency, believed in Christ and the Church—men who laid the foundations amid peril and obloquy of our present glorious heritage. Bishop Williams' Sermon sounds the true key-note, gives the right watchword for the Church's future. It will excite deep, grateful emotions in every man who has the heart of a loyal Churchman in him. It will mantle with the blush of shame the cheeks of those (if there are such) who have sought to introduce strifes and alienations among us that they might, perchance, thereby compass

…will prompt to new efforts deeper
…would pervade the whole Church
…At the risk of presenting a mutila-
…we give the following brief extract:
…, that God can execute upon a
…formation of party spirit. And what
…spiritual famine and starvation may
…in vitals, and she does not know
…but the wrangling and tumult of
…without. Wide fields of labor
…but men are so afraid that their
…one will go forward and take
…energy, and zeal, and love die
…becomes an object of contempt to
…curse is on her in its most awful
…destruction.
…heart, that I can stand here this
…evil lives not in our borders.
…found no lodgment. And if we
…peace and well-being, let us in
…when it may, come from where
…stalking boldly to our doors to
…upon us by agencies that in-
…let it ever meet, as it ever has
…us see to it, that this Diocese, in
…it has stood; and that we will
…Church, a watchword that com-

…By the Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.
…with an Introduction by the Rev.
…Baltimore. Joseph Robinson.

…It contains a reprint of two
…*Remembrancer*, in 1854, written
…known to our readers: it also
…Rambler" and "Dublin Re-
…and also a correspondence
…the apostate Manning, on the
…which Manning is fairly routed
…all his sophistry. The honest
…a match for the wily, slip-
…that discretion is the better part

…the Church. Mr. Meyrick shows
…that the Romish Church is
…her latest "Saint." He then
…it in two particulars; first, in
…Theory of Theft. He shows that
…enormity of unmitigated fraud.
…this Rome's latest and favorite
…French Abbé, that Rome "lengthens
…imposes on the credulity of her
…damnation, and, at the same
…morality. We observe that special
…to the attention of Romanists in
…Clergy and Laity were well posted up as
…doctor; a man who justifies all the im-
…"Provincial Letters" charged upon the Jesuit

We have the "*Theologia Moralis*" of Liguori before us. Mr. Meyrick, in selecting two of the virtues, and their corresponding vices, by which to test the character of Romish teaching, has not chosen those in which the enormity of her vileness most shockingly appears. Indeed, the depth and stench of her filth would never bear to be stirred up under English nostrils. But this much may be safely affirmed; that the gross immorality, the absence of high-toned moral sentiment, and the prevalence of vice in all its forms, which characterize Romish countries without one exception, are the natural outworking of Rome's authorized moral teaching. And hence it is, we suppose, that one of the first indications of approaching apostasy, on the part of some of our late perverts, was the entire absence of truthfulness. Why it is that men of honest, ingenuous minds can be made the dupes of such a system, is, to us, a mystery. For those brought up and educated in the bosom of this Communion, there may be some palliation; but there is an awful account to be rendered by those who have, with their eyes open, thus voluntarily renounced the truth of God to believe a lie.

Again we thank Mr. Coxe for this addition to our Church reading. Let it go into every Parochial and every Clergyman's Library. The insulting impudence and boldness of Rome require plain treatment, and Mr. Meyrick's contribution will answer as well as anything that we have recently seen for this purpose.

Bishop Smith's Fifth Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Kentucky, in St. Paul's Church, Louisville, May 28, 1856. 8vo., pp. 37.

Every point presented in this Charge, Conversion, Regeneration, Baptism, Christian Nurture, has been treated with fullness in our previous pages, and we do not care to enter again upon their discussion here. To contrast, however, what the Bishop calls "educational and traditionary religion," on the one hand, with "emotional and personal religion," on the other, as is the design of this Charge, seems to us a needless expenditure of ingenuity. The parting words of every Minister of the Church to Parents and Sponsors, ere they leave the Font, show what the nature of that solemn duty is which the Church imposes upon all her members; and in that duty there is no such contrast between what is educational and what is personal and emotional. And on this fact or truth we should base our criticism upon the Charge, if we had room to develop our thoughts at length. In its practical bearing upon the Church the subject is vital.

A Letter to the Right Reverend Bishops of Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas, Texas, Mississippi, Florida, South Carolina and North Carolina. From the Bishop of Louisiana. New Orleans, 1856. 8vo., pp. 17.

The object of this Letter is to secure the establishment, at some central and accessible point, of one Collegiate and Theological Institution, for the especial patronage and control of the Church in the abovenamed Dioceses. The case is well argued. The necessity exists; the central point seems to be located by Providence; the means are abundant; and the whole plan is apparently entirely feasible. We are painfully surprised to hear the Bishop say, that in all these several Dioceses "we have not now in existence, so far as I know, a single seminary for the instruction of boys, under the distinct appointment or control of the Church, rising to the level of a first class grammar school." And yet this humiliating confession made in the face of a population of 5,800,000! The location proposed is in the southeastern corner of Tennessee, where, owing to the radiating and intersecting lines of railway built or now building, the Bishop assures us that citizens from all the States named can be brought together in from 36 to 48 hours. Besides this, "they offer mountain air and pure water; are beyond the reach of epidemics; the cost of living is cheap; and they are within the pale of the plantation State."

We should say, let at least four of the best men from the South be located at

[illegible] Episcopal organizations [illegible] "divine institution." And [illegible] at the Reforma- [illegible] relations [illegible] that the latter [illegible] thwarted by [illegible] that the expres- [illegible] abstract question; and [illegible] mushroom *anti*-Episcopal [illegible] to find Bishop Davis [illegible] identity, and ordinary ex- [illegible] institution, and therefore [illegible]. But it is one of divine [illegible] large enough. And [illegible] are where the adminis- [illegible] corrupt." But yet we have [illegible] faith in Christ as to believe He will [illegible] own work. And as a matter of fact, [illegible] the history of the Church when the Episco- [illegible] connection with the "purity of the [illegible] the way" as well as "the Truth and the Life." Nor do we [illegible] hypothetical questions as to the character of these churches in the order of the divine economy in Christ's Kingdom: and especially when charitable opinions are tortured into arguments for Schism: that is, if there is, or can be any such thing as Schism in our day. Of course the membership of individuals, as such, in the Church, is another and distinct question; which membership, however, they must have, or else Schism is not

of them at all. On the whole, there is a degree of moderation in ris' views on one point of a somewhat wider latitude than many ;ether approve; but yet he holds, "in faith," as he says, and most , on all these points, views, positive enough to enlist his whole heart od which must secure him to the ranks of earnest, loyal workers in Vineyard. They, therefore, who have so ostentatiously claimed the ıpport of their own strange denial and rejection of a great Church ne which the most moderate men used to hold, are simply mis-

TTINGHAM'S FOURTH CHARGE to the Clergy and Diocese of Maryland, Work of Christ by His Ministry, in its Nature, Conditions, and ns." Baltimore: 1856. 8vo. pp. 34.

ay of "unrest" Bishop Whittingham has uttered with a trumpet ı great truths to which it is well that the attention of the Church "Indolent remisness in setting about the work assigned us, or re-undertake it; and a wayward inclination to disregard, or be dis-with, the prescription of a settled previous order for its prosecution" , in the Bishop's terse language, the real hindrances in our doing the h Christ has assigned His Church.

VISDOM OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH: Being Selections from his Writ-Passages of his Letters and Table-Talk; with a Biographical Memoir s. By EVERT H. DUYCKINCK. Redfield: New York. 1856. 12mo. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

er of the Article in the April Church Review on Sydney Smith will amusing volume in the work before us, and especially as edited by ritic as Mr. Duyckinck; and he will not be disappointed. The book ; full of the "wit and wisdom" of Sydney Smith; and abounds in here every word fairly bristles with pungent satire, and also in pas-ofound thoughts eloquently expressed.

TURES. By JULIA RUSSELL MCMASTERS. Philadelphia: H. Cowperth-1856. 12mo. pp. 64.

Poetry? We cannot tell for the life of us what it is; and yet if we ition formally expressed we might perhaps then apply the test to fully printed volume. Coledrige says "Poetry is the proper anti-ience." Leigh Hunt says "Poetry is the utterance of a passion for ty, and power." Channing regards poetry as "an aspiration after ate of existence." Aristotle describes "Poetry as one of the arts of ' yet Pultenham rejects "imitation," and presents "the poet as a inventor." Selden thought "Poetry a most absurd and irrational nd spoke contemptously of verses and versifiers. Again we ask, Poetry?" It is a difficult question to answer, and for ourselves we y. The "Poems" before us are mostly upon themes among the purest , of a strictly domestic character, "Silver Pictures" of home life. em with the stern eye of a critic is abhorrent to our taste, and we shall t it.

EPRESENTED AND MISREPRESENTED; or a two-fold character of Popery, By the Rev. JOHN GOTHER. Baltimore: Lucas Brothers.

ONS WHY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION OUGHT TO BE PREFERRED TO ES, &c. &c. New York: G. Dunigan & Brother.

o Roman Catholic tracts are curiosities in their way, as specimens ular literature which that Church scatters among her people. For

first they recognize Human Reason as antedating and authorizing Belief; contrary to the true Catholic principle, when properly defined, viz:—"Neque enim quæro intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam." And, secondly, many of these "Reasons" and "Representations" are such in themselves as Brownson and the whole School of Ultramontanists, actually scorn as no better than the rankest Protestantism. They know full well that Popery cannot stand for a moment on such a basis as this. If it were worth while, we should like to quote some of these "Reasons" and "Representations," and side by side with them, some of the corresponding dogmas of Romanism, touching questions of doctrine, discipline, and morality. These tracts are therefore but a weak defense of the most moderate kind of Roman Catholicism; and which the more intelligent Romanists know now to be wholly indefensible. Of course we have more charity for Romanists of this type; but it is not the genuine article which they hold and profess. There is no true test of True Catholicity which does not point to that Branch of CHRIST'S One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which we trust will yet be the refuge of many of this class of Roman Catholics. A movement in this direction should be the object of our labors and prayers.

THE EARNEST MAN: A SKETCH OF THE CHARACTER AND LABORS OF ADONIRAM JUDSON, FIRST MISSIONARY TO BURMAH. By Mrs. H. C. CONANT. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 498.

This volume is a brief history of the life and labors of Dr. Judson, drawn chiefly from the large Memoir of Dr. Wayland, with gleanings from letters, journals, public addresses, and other works connected with the subject. The most prominent incidents in the career of this heroic and self-denying missionary, whose name for more than thirty years has been "a household word," among the friends of missions, and peculiarly so among his own denomination, are told by Mrs. Conant in that unaffected style which best suits the subject. The attention of Dr Judson was first drawn to the subject of Foreign Missions, while a student at Andover in 1809, by reading Dr. Buchanan's "Star in the East," which gives an account of the discovery of a secluded church in Hindoostan, tracing its origin directly to the Apostles themselves. It is worthy of note in this connection, that the reading of this same pamphlet by Dr. Cooke—a sketch of whom appeared in the last number of the Review—first determined him to investigate the evidence on which the doctrines of the Christian religion rest. One cannot but wonder that those two men of strong and earnest minds, searching for the truth, in reading the account of this old church in the East, which derived its descent from St. Thomas, and which "through the ages all along" had preserved the Episcopal form of Church Government and Liturgy, should fail to be convinced that this was the form of Church government and mode of worship established by Christ himself, and intended to be perpetuated through his Apostles and their successors.

Dr. Judson thus resolved to devote himself to the missionary work, after much anxiety and labor, in fact originating in conjunction with Nott, Mills and Gordon Hall, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, was sent out under the patronage of this Board to India. On the voyage thither, the views of Dr. Judson became shaken in regard to the subject of Baptism, finally inducing him to embrace the doctrines of the Baptists, and on his arrival himself and wife were immersed in the Baptist Chapel at Calcutta. This change of views, of course, involved the dismissal of Dr. Judson from the service of the American Board, and resulted eventually in the formation of the American Baptist Missionary Society for Foreign Missions.

Our limits will not allow us to follow the career of this "earnest man" through the persecutions he received from the East India Company, his final settlement at Rangoon, his wonderful success there among the natives, the perils and sufferings of the Burmese War, and his varied personal trials and afflictions. Few

men in any sphere of action have ever exhibited more sincerity, more lion-hearted resoluteness and earnestness of purpose throughout a singularly varied and perilous career. His story is related in this volume with simplicity and feeling, and will be heartily welcomed by the religious public as an able and appropriate memorial of one whose biography is as rich in suggestion, as his life was unworldly and disinterested.

THE LIFE AND TRAVELS OF HERODOTUS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY BEFORE CHRIST; an Imaginary Biography founded on fact, illustrative of the History, Manners, Religion, Literature, Arts, and Social Condition of the Greeks, Egyptians, Persians, Babylonians, Hebrews, Scythians, and other Ancient Nations, in the days of Pericles and Nehemiah. By J. TALBOYS WHEELER, F. R. G. S. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 444, 466. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

If the reader will only remember that this is romance, and not veritable history; if he will run the risk of impressions partly true and partly false, and so unreliable; if he will forgive certain anachronisms in synchronizing men, separated by some hundreds of years; then we can recommend him to the lively and entertaining pages of Mr. Wheeler. The author has evident familiarity with Greece in its palmiest days, its history, mythology, customs, literature, schools, mythology, &c., &c.; and if he has taken great liberties in weaving the thread of his story, he has yet given a vivid picture of nations and people which have passed away, and which only live on the pages of a history which, at best is, to a considerable extent, fabulous. For Herodotus himself is to be read with caution; and has mingled poetry and prose together in the beautiful current of his pages, so that it is sometimes impossible to separate the one from the other. We confess, however, that romance enters what we hold to be a forbidden field, when it enters the sacred domain of history.

REV. DR. T. W. COIT'S CHRISTMAS EVE SERMON ON EXCLUSIVENESS. Third edition, revised. Troy, N. Y. 1856. 8vo. pp. 104.

If Dr. Beman is not heartily sick of this whole matter, and does not already rue the day when he so wantonly, rashly, and unjustly attacked an imperfect newspaper report of this Sermon, then he is a more stubbornly stupid man than we supposed. His random, wholesale, indiscriminate assaults upon Dr. Coit, and upon the Church, are met by the doctor, one by one, and a keener or more withering rejoinder has never appeared in the whole history of our Church controversy. One thing this present discussion fairly illustrates, and that is, that the Church will never prosper in this country, except upon her distinctive principles. Those principles will never be allowed a fair exhibition till the Church has first vindicated her position. Wherever and whenever this has been faithfully done, she has never yet failed, in the end, to win over respect, confidence and support. Dr. Coit is very careful not to deny that there is a sense, and a most important sense, in which the Church *is* "exclusive." She could not be the Church of Christ without it were so. The simple fact is, that Episcopacy and Parity, as systems of Christianity, are antagonistic to each other, theoretically and practically; and while the *odium theologicum* is an ungracious thing to the Churchman, the only question is, whether he will run the risk of being charged with it, or yield up the whole ground. We find an anecdote afloat respecting the Presbyterian, Dr. Hewitt, which we give in this connection, *verbatim et literatim*. It is too good and too true to be lost. We copy as it stands from a Presbyterian periodical.

"At the opening of the Methodist New York Conference, East, recently held at Bridgeport, Dr. Hewit, who happened to be present, was led forward by Rev. Mr. Fletcher, pastor of the Methodist church in the place, and through the Bishop introduced to the Conference. As per custom, the whole body arose and bowed; and Dr. H., prompted it would seem by the appropriate courtesy, proceeded to give expression to his feelings of fellowship for all who bear the

...importance of a more catholic charity among ... Church.

... Bangs arose and said, 'He fully recip... that although in early life he had been ... older he grew the more he saw the ... by an anecdote touching the form... ...ian Union, to enforce the importance ...—so emphasizing the last sentence ... was a reproof to his non-interchange of ... own.

... turned to Dr. H., to read the effect of ... and with that dignity and gravity for ... remarks of Dr. Bangs, which he most ... so pertinent and illustrative of ... the temptation to relate it. All ears

... Sabbath was enforcing the duty 'of love ... things essential to its maintenance ... through sixthly and lastly, his ... of each division with marked ... 'Have you really done, sir?' The ... his last proposition. 'Well, sir,' ... that you should omit one thing. ... peace among neighbors.' 'And ... 'Why,' replied the deacon, 'a

... ...ghter, and put in good humor with ... ...ened Puritanism. Exclusiveness ... ...ly used and understood, is seen ... and integrity."

... of the Sermon of Dr. Coit contains

... Georgetown, D. C., before Con... ...reat Lessons from Little Things."

... ...s when he preaches, and his famil... ...stitute of taste and sense, enables ... ...plain way. We select a few dis...

... ...versity of opinion among us on ... ...Presbyterian system: a recurrence to ... ...to the primitive model of an ... ...mals subject to its authority, ...s, and every appliance for con... ...ses of their bodies and estates."

... ...taste and scholarship, and for com... ...English. Too long has the golden ... ...our only popular treasure of ... ...s of Archbishop Leighton on St. ... ...mentary on the Gospels,' of some un... ...to family and parochial libraries,

... ...already by their sectarian quarrels; ... Are we going to be such suicides as to ... ...s which God has given us to use against ... ...What ... ...to God of discord among His ... ...and the fact that

here is only one place where a spirit of discord can be freely and eternally indulged, is it not amazing that any Christian can endure any separation, for which he is responsible, from a single Christian brother?"

"There is nothing more pleasing, in view of the unhappy divisions among Christians in this land, than the consideration that they are the sins of forefathers visited on their children, but more the children's misfortune than their fault. We may believe, then, that divine institutions present the only ultimate reliance for the safety of divine truth, without a moment's hesitation, in honoring the piety of individual Christians, whatever they may call themselves, as the genuine fruit of the Spirit. * * * * The law of charity, however, does not forbid us to 'rejoice in the truth;' and whatever may be the merits of others, we are bound to know our own advantages as a Church; to employ our peculiar talent, and to 'neglect not the gift that is in us.' No man succeeds who lacks confidence in the art or profession he has chosen; and we have no business to be Churchmen, unless we are inspired with confidence in the Church's character, and animated by a holy enthusiasm for her progress, as that which is good and profitable for men."

RUBNER'S BIBLIOGRAPHICAL GUIDE TO AMERICAN LITERATURE; being a classified list of Books in all departments of Literature and Science, published in the United States of America during the last forty years; with an Introduction, three Appendices, &c., &c. London: Trubner & Co., No. 12, Paternoster Row. 1855. 12mo. pp. 108.

The volume before us has been issued by Messrs. Trubner & Co., with the design of bringing American Literature and Science more directly before the European public. We suppose it is hardly ever asked now in London, "who reads an American book?" unless it be by some miserable cockney; for our poets, historians, essayists, philologists, naturalists, &c., &c., are as highly appreciated in the old world as in the new. The Introduction to the volume before us contains a carefully prepared sketch of the rise, progress, and present condition of our national literature. Messrs. Trubner & Co. are paying special attention to the American branch of their business, and we do not hesitate to recommend them to individuals and to public institutions who may wish to import books of any kind.

THE LAW OF LIBERALITY BETWEEN CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS, APPLIED TO THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. Cincinnati: 1856. 12mo. pp. 12.

The writer of this little tract regards the "Protestant Episcopal Church" as nothing more than a mere Sect among Sects, the distinctions between her and them being "innocent peculiarities," or "non-essential errors." It is just such teaching as this which, as we know, has driven some earnest-minded laymen over to Rome, and will drive more. We cannot help being reminded by it of the Jesuits who, two hundred years ago, clandestinely attached themselves to the English Dissenters, and joined with them in their bitter crusade against the Church of England, and who were among the noisiest in condemning what they called the "Popery and bigotry" of the Church, and in proclaiming their own "inward illumination." One of them who had joined the Quakers, and who beat them all in "*theeing*" and "*thouing*," &c., was suspected, was taken up and searched, and his boots found to be stuffed with Popish documents. We do not doubt the honesty of the writer of this tract; but we do wonder that any man, professing to be a Churchman, could have written and published it. It is in the same vein with a radical work published a few years since, called "Causes and Cure of Puseyism," by a Mr. Ira Warren.

The Church of the New Testament and of the Catholic Creeds, which we take as an Article of our Faith, and on which our souls repose as they recoil from these strifes, and divisions, and heresies, and novelties of the day, is a holier thing than it is represented in the tract before us. And we are surprised that the writer has found no place to rebuke that spirit of *Sectism* now abroad

over which the best men in the Sects are mourning, and in view of which, they are publicly congratulating us upon our secure position. Some of them are even heard to say that if they were to begin life again they would cast in their lot with us.

BERTHA. By FREDERIKA BREMER. Translated by MARY HOWITT. 12mo. pp. 383. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co.

In our notice of Miss Bremer's "Homes of the New World," in a late Review, we were constrained to allude to her as a thorough convert to, and an unquestionable advocate of, those infidel notions of "social progress" which are productive of so much misery and ruin in society; and to her companionship and sympathy with such men as Theodore Parker, Emerson, &c., &c. The same pestiferous doctrines are industriously taught in England; and such writers as the Howitts, Miss Bremer, and others, of the same school, are throwing the charms of genius and the fascinations of poetry around this cunning device of Satan. The work before us is one of this class. The social usages of Sweden may be as fruitful of domestic wretchedness as Miss Bremer represents; though we doubt it. But if it is so, she is not a true reformer thus to cast contempt on God's holy ordinance of Matrimony, and to advocate obedience to what she calls, in the cant phraseology of the day, "the innermost life." For this, in reality, as she very well knows, is nothing more or less than promiscuous concubinage. We are sorry Mr. Putnam should publish such stuff. If we do not mistake the tone of the public mind, he will find the traffic in such wares a bad speculation. At any rate, we advise our readers to eschew every thing from the pen of Miss Bremer. Of course her writings lack the coarseness of the works of Eugene Sue and Alexander Dumas, but they are for that very reason the more dangerous. Keep them from your libraries and your families.

AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN BEHALF OF LAMARTINE.

We have received this "Appeal" for publishing in this country "A Familiar Course of Literature," by Lamartine. It is in the hands of his friend J. B. DESPLACE, and is most warmly and nobly seconded by WASHINGTON IRVING, MR. BANCROFT, and many of the most distinguished scholars and statesmen of our country. It is well known that Lamartine's patriotism has forbidden him to bow the knee to the fortunate usurper of his country's liberties, and has made him the victim of the severest reverses of fortune; and he now looks to this land of liberty for sympathy by the voluntary subscriptions of a free people to his productions as an author. The distinguished gentlemen who have taken the matter in hand, say, "This confession of hard necessity comes from a man who, as a poet, orator, legislator, historian, and statesman, has united in himself more varied claims to distinction than any public man of our century."

The remembrance of that sympathy which France once extended to us, and the self-sacrifice of such a man, who cannot, and will not be false to himself, will not fail of a generous response. We copy the following from the Circular:

"*The Familiar Course of Literature* will be composed annually of twelve monthly numbers of about eighty pages each, making for one year two fine volumes of five hundred pages each, with the portrait of the author. It will be written exclusively by Lamartine. There will be one edition in French and one in English. For greater convenience, and to avoid the irregularities of arrival from Europe, the *Familiar Course of Literature* will be sent Quarterly to subscribers—that is, three numbers at once. The first issue in the United States will take place early in September; it has already been commenced in France.

"*The amount of the subscription is* $6 *a year, payable in advance.* No subscription will be taken for lees than one year.

"Those desiring to subscribe will please address their names and subscription (*post paid*) to M. J. B. DESPLACE, at the Messrs. D. Appleton's, 346 and 348

adway, N. Y. They will be good enough to specify, at the same time, ether they wish for the *Familiar Course of Literature* in French or in glish. They are requested to send in their subscriptions as early as convent, so that they may be included in the September delivery."

ORT STORIES AND LESSONS ON THE FESTIVALS, FASTS, AND SAINTS' DAYS, OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1856. 12mo. pp. 334.

This is an English work very cleverly done, and is here in this edition apted to the language of the American Prayer-Book, and to the wants of our ldren. The stories will interest the young and lead them on pleasantly ough all the cycle of the Christian Year. It is a beautiful feature of the urch System—there is nothing else in the country like it—which associates continually the minds and hearts of children with the Founder and early rtyrs of our Faith. It teaches them reverence and humility, and begets, en guarded as the Church guards them, not credulity, but humility and st. There is no such system to produce symmetry of character.

R. DR. BOLLES' SERMON: "The Free and Independent Church," in Trinity hurch, Cleveland, Ohio, June 15th, 1856.

The Rev. Dr. Bolles has presented a view of the Church, vastly important, rious to every sound Churchman, and yet too generally forgotten. The urch is "free and independent," alike of State and of voluntary Institutions. s not human, but divine, in its origin, policy, weapons, and aims. And refore Political alliances and intermeddlings, Moral Suasion, social truckling the motley anti-Church organizations of the day, &c., &c., are to be lost sight in the singleness of faith and of implicit obedience with which we follow IST. This is the true Philosophy, and we wish Churchmen were more bued with its spirit. They would be more Catholic and more Evangelical. at was an awful, yet glorious award allotted, "*According to your faith be it to you.*"

PLETON'S RAILWAY AND STEAM NAVIGATION GUIDE. Aug., 1856. 4to. pp. 250.

This is the most perfect travelers' "Guide" published. Each Railroad is illtrated by a separate Map, on which are given stations, distances, connecons, and all the information respecting hotels, stages, objects of interest, &c. , necessary for the traveler. A recent tour through eleven States and nada enables us to speak from experience of the general correctness and the venience of this compact Manual.

ARCTIC EXPLORATIONS IN THE YEARS 1853, '54, '55. By ELISHA KENT KANE, M. D., U. S. N. Philadelphia: Childs & Peterson. 1856.

We have received specimen pages of this work, which is to be published on first of October, and will be comprised in two octavo volumes, of nearly pages each, containing 22 fine steel plates, and about 300 superb wood enavings, also four Maps, showing their important discoveries, &c. We regret at a work so truly national in its character, one adding so much to the amount human knowledge, and reflecting as it will so much credit upon our national aracter should have failed to receive an appropriation from the U. S. Senate. s deserve the stigma which will be fastened upon us abroad. "That is the y," it will be said, "that the *Model Republic* rewards its public benefactors." e work is elegantly executed by Messrs Childs & Peterson, who have evitly spared no expense to issue the volumes in the very highest style of dern art. The engravings, maps, press-work, paper, &c., are all that could desired. The public will, we doubt not, reward the intrepid explorer by truly liberal patronage. The Hon. Mr. Tyson, in his noble Report to the

House of Representatives, cites the following as a summary of the important information gained by this exploration:

"1. The survey and delineation of the north coast of Greenland, to its termination by a great glacier.

"2. The survey of this glacial mass, and its extension northward into the new land named *Washington*.

"3. The discovery of a large channel to the northwest, free from ice, and leading into an open and expanding area equally free. The whole embraces an iceless area of 4,200 miles.

"4. The discovery and delineation of a large tract of land, forming the extension northward of the American continent.

"5. The completed survey of the American coast to the south and west, as far as Cape Sabine, thus connecting our survey with the last determined position of Captain Inglefield, and completing the circuit of the straits and bay heretofore known at their southernmost opening as Smith's Sound."

We are glad to see that there are already about 30,000 subscribers to the publication.

HARPER'S STORY BOOKS. No. 21. THE THREE GOLD DOLLARS; or an Account of the Adventures of Robin Green. No. 22. THE GIBRALTAR GALLERY: Being an Account of various things both curious and useful.

These are very entertaining books for children; their moral tone is healthy; they are sure to captivate the attention of the young, to fortify them with virtuous principles and manly resolutions, and to increase their store of useful knowledge.

BISHOP BURGESS' THIRD CHARGE: In St. Mark's Church, Augusta, Me., July 9, 1856.

Never since our recollection have the Charges of so large a number of our Right Rev. Fathers grappled with the living questions of the day, the real wants of the Church, the needs of dying men, as in those which have lately fallen within our notice. Bishop Burgess starts with these pregnant questions—and in his own words—"which, when they are faithfully followed back, are found to reach down to the roots of our ecclesiastical system. How far are we prepared to meet the spiritual wants of our country and our generation? Does our Church possess and exercise every power of expansion that must belong to the Church of Christ? How far can it consent to satisfy those who love a highly symbolical ritual, rich with the adornments of consecrated art, or those who are attracted by an exact and ascetic mode of personal discipline? How far, on the other side, can it adapt itself to the spiritual tastes of those who would indulge to the utmost 'the liberty of prophesying' in the social meeting, or who delight in the burst of jubilant song under the open sky? Can it protect itself against secret Popery, or against incipient Neology? Is it to be wished that it should erect any additional barriers, or give additional strength to its ancient bulwarks? Are the parties which stand within it, side by side, permanent necessities, or temporary accidents? Is it better that they should be organized bodies, or does such organization tend towards ultimate schism? Can the whole Church act together, in the support and administration of its Missions, its Sunday Schools, and its other labors of love? If not, what are to be the limits of its combined efforts; and how far shall all which lies beyond be left to individual choice, or conducted by voluntary association?"

These questions, the Bishop considers at length, and in a spirit at once large-hearted and Catholic. The Bishop concedes to a true Catholicity a pretty wide latitude, yet the tone of the Charge is throughout conservative. While he is for a very large liberty of opinion and action, as necessary to distinguish a Church meant to be Catholic from a mere sect, yet he also says, and we are grateful for such words:—"I hope that the day is very distant when the Church, as such,

declared unequal to any of its first and most obvious duties, amongst
I conceive one to be the general organization and regulation of its Mis-

in, he says, "It is indeed a humiliating spectacle . . . when they who
neel at one altar, unite in one imposition of hands, sign the same solemn
ents, meet in the same sacred councils, and do all together which appertains
r holiest character, that of a Christian Church, yet seem to have a nearer,
and more intimate relation in which they cannot commingle; the rela-
parties within that Church, pledged to unceasing and universal rivalship,
he very edge of ecclesiastical separation. Let such beware, lest they
provoke the taunting or doubting enquiry, What is the benefit of com-
where there is no fellowship?"
ope the spirit of this paragraph will pervade our next General Conven-

R. DAVID C. PAGE'S DISCOURSE ON "THE OFFICE OF A DEACON," at the
nation of Mr. J. M. Curtis, in St. John's Church, Louisville, Ky., May
856.

age's excellent Sermon is one among many indications that correct views
taining among us of the true nature and appropriate functions of the
old Ministry; a doctrine theoretically held, and yet practically almost
l by the Church. To restore the primitive Order of Deacons is one step
the right direction.

. N. LITTLEJOHN'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE HOUSE OF CONVOCATION OF TRINITY
EGE, HARTFORD, CONN., July 16, 1856.

position taken by Mr. Littlejohn is, that the elements of all true Reform
ind us, not before us; that they are traditional, not things of invention;
a great truth, which he takes as his stand-point, he illustrates in its re-
irst to Institutions, next to the mind itself, and finally to the Products
positories of the mind—its Literature, its Philosophy, and its works of
The theme chosen for this Address was the greatest the speaker could
y have selected; its range is boundless as the realms of thought, and
the unfathomable mysteries of GOD. That goodness only is true great-
d that goodness is supernatural, in and from the Cross alone; the triumph
Moral over the Intellectual; of Love over Knowledge—and all this not
stract truth, but in all its concrete and multiform relations—this is the
of the Address. The speaker's position is universally and inevitably
in its relation to Moral Truth and to Man in all his Moral relations.
r it is true, and on what grounds it is not necessarily true, in the world
wledge, is a pregnant question. Mr. Littlejohn's application of his sub-
the Antiquarian, the Radical, and the Futurist, is worthy of all consider-
The Address may be recommended as an excellent tonic. It will, or
, be subscribed to, in all its points, just according to the reader's con-
of the relation between Knowledge and Wisdom, for the Address opens
tions which have more than exhausted the best intellects of every age.

. MORTON. A Novel. By FRANCIS PARKMAN, Author of "History of the
piracy of Pontiac," and "Prairie and Rocky Mountain Life." Boston:
ips, Sampson & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 414.

M. A Novel. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp.

. By PROSPER MERIMEE. Translated from the French. Boston:
ps, Sampson, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 310.

—[illegible] By Miss A. A. Goodall. New York: [illegible] pp. 311.

[illegible] Nursery. Learning to Read [illegible] designed to interest and assist young children [illegible] in beginning to read. By [illegible] and sixty Engravings. New York: Harper [illegible] New Haven: T. H. Pease

[illegible] Second Annual Convention of Young Men's [illegible] United States and British Provinces in North [illegible]. With the Rev. Dr. C. M. Butler's Address [illegible] Cincinnati, O. 1856. 8vo. pp. 114.

[illegible] Society of St. Paul's Church, New Haven, [illegible] Anniversary Meeting, on Wednesday Eve[illegible] New Haven. 1856. 8vo. pp. 19.

[illegible] Sermon in Calvary Church, Memphis, [illegible] 1856. 8vo. pp. 28.

[illegible] Review of Webster's System, in the Dem[illegible] From the Democratic Review of June. [illegible] Springfield, Mass. 8vo. pp. 16

[illegible] which is still kept up against "Webster's [illegible] its assailants, little or great, who has [illegible] one respectable scholar who does not [illegible] unquestionable preeminence in its etymologi-

[illegible] the Finances of the Foreign and Domes[illegible] Protestant Episcopal Church, addressed to the [illegible] Presbyter. Washington. 1856. 8vo.

[illegible] to the wretchedly meagre pittance [illegible] sessions, and to the efforts hitherto made [illegible] recommends the following mea[illegible] consent of the Bishops of the Dio[illegible] number of parishes—say from 5 to 8— [illegible] the following work:— [illegible] and vestries of the several parishes in [illegible] amount they will engage to contrib[illegible]

[illegible] to receive and transmit the amount

[illegible] number of the *small* non-contributing [illegible] to stir up a large number of the [illegible] have never yet manifested any real [illegible] How these parishes—*or rather* [illegible] is the most important question. [illegible] sentiment steadily gaining among us. [illegible] to disregard.

[illegible] Address at the Dedication of the Evergreen Ceme[illegible] [illegible] July 23d, 1856.

CHURCH HOME. Rev. W. B. W. Howe's Sermon, Reports, &c., at the Sixth Anniversary, St. Philip's Church, Charleston, S. C., June 11, 1856.

REV. DR. R. A. HALLAM'S SERMON: the Sacerdotal Tribe and Order; at Trinity Ordination, Christ Church, Middletown, Conn.

REV. J. S. KIDNEY'S POEM, before House of Convocation of Trinity College, July 16, 1856.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY; MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—Course of Lectures, &c. 1856-57. The course begins first Wednesday in November, 1856.

ST. ANN'S EPISCOPAL INSTITUTE for Young Ladies, Washington City. Rev. William J. Clark, Rector.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Bancroft, L. W.	Meade,	June 27,	Chapel Theo. Sem., Alexandria, V
Brewer, A. L.	Williams,	July 6,	Christ, Norwich, Conn.
Brewster, Milton,	DeLancey,	April 6,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
Bonte, J. H. C.	McIlvaine,	July 27,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, O.
Caulfield, F. D.	Doane,	June 29,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Chittenden, R. L.	Meade,	June 27,	Chapel Theological Seminary, Va.
Chase, Francis,	Chase,	July 6,	Trinity, Claremont, N. H.
Curran, John P.	McIlvaine,	July 27,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, O.
Dailey, James L.	Scott,	May 18,	Trinity, Portland, Oregon Territo
Dalrymple, S. B.	Potter, A.	July 6,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Early, William T.	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
Elwyn, Alfred,	Potter, A.	July 6,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Farrington, Wm. G.	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
Fogg, T. B.	Williams,	July 2,	Trinity, Brooklyn, Conn.
Fearns, Charles W.	McIlvaine,	July 27,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, O.
Grover, James L.	McIlvaine,	July 3,	St. Paul's, Columbus, O.
Harlow, E. H.	Meade,	June 27,	Chapel Theological Seminary, Va.
Hurd, George E.	Chase,	July 6,	Trinity, Claremont, N. H.
Haughton, T. G.	Atkinson,	May 25,	St. Peter's, Washington, N. C.
Hatton, Wm. H. D.	Lee, A.	June 29,	Ascension, Claymont, Del.
Hamilton, Moses,	McIlvaine,	July 27,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, O.
Jewett, E. H.	DeLancey,	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
Jeffries, P. H.	McIlvaine,	July 27,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, O.
Knickerbacker, D. B.	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
Kershaw, H. J.	Meade,	June 27,	Chapel Theological Seminary, Va.
Kellogg, Charles T.	Williams,	July 10,	St. Andrew's, Meriden, Conn.
Maxcy, Jr., E. W.	Clark,	July 6,	Grace, Providence, R. I.
Morrelle, Daniel,	Atkinson,	May 25,	St. Peter's, Washington, N. C.
Marshall, William,	Lee, A.	June 29,	Ascension, Claymont, Del.
Meachem, T. G.	DeLancey,	Aug. 3,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
Mackay, Henry,	Potter, A.	Aug. 10,	Christ, Huntington, Pa.
Oertel, Frederick,	Potter, H.	Aug. 31,	St. John's, Clifton, N. Y.
Penniman, J. A.	Eastburn,	June 29,	St. Stephen's, Lynn, Mass.
Peet, Robert B.	Meade,	June 27,	Chapel Theological Seminary, Va.
Roberts, Warren H.	McIlvaine,	July 27,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, O.
Sievers-Barten, Otto,	Clark,	June 27,	Incarnation, N. Y.
Stuart, J. W.	Davis,	June 22,	St. Helena's, Beaufort, S. C.
Tong-Chu-Kiung,	Boone,	Feb. 10,	Mission Chapel, Shanghai, China.
Townsend, John,	Williams,	May 18,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
Taylor, J. W.	Davis,	June 15,	St. Peter's, Charleston, S. C.
Upjohn, J. A.	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.

PRIESTS.

	Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev.	Cook, Wm. H.	Williams,	July 18,	St. James', New London, Conn.
"	Dunlop, Geo. K.	Hawks,	Aug. 7,	St. John's, St. Louis, Mo.
"	Gibson, G. W.	Payne,	Dec. 23, '55,	St. Mark's, Cape Palmas, Africa.
"	Grammer, J. E.	Johns,	June 27,	Chapel Theological Seminary, Va.
"	LaTourette, J. A. M.	McIlvaine,	July 3,	St. Paul's, Columbus, O.
"	Lloyd, Wm. F.	McIlvaine,	July 3,	St. Paul's, Columbus, O.
"	Linn, John B.	Williams,	July 13,	St. James', New London, Conn.
"	Lewis, E. L.	DeLancey,	Aug. 3,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
"	Paul, Robert,	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
"	Pickman, Wm. R.	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
"	Pennell, G. C.	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
"	Sterling, W. R.	Potter, H.	June 29,	Trinity, N. Y. City.
"	Shepard, P. L.	Williams,	July 13,	St. James', New London, Conn.
"	Thompson, H. M.	Kemper,	Aug. 31,	St. John's, Portage, Wis.
"	Van Nostrand, A.	DeLancey,	Aug. 3,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Ascension,	McCoskry,	Aug. 10,	Ontonagon, Mich.
Christ,	Potter, A.	July 9,	Germantown, Pa.
Grace,	Potter, A.	June 18,	Lodersville, Pa.
St. John's,	DeLancey,	July 12,	Whitestown, W. N. Y.
St. John's,	DeLancey,	July 18,	Vienna, W. N. Y.
St. John's,	Kemper,	Aug. 30,	Portage, Wisconsin.
St. Luke's,	DeLancey,	July 29,	Brockport, W. N. Y.
St. Mary's,	Polk,	July 6,	Franklin, Louisiana.
St. Mary's,	Potter, H.	Sept. 15,	Mott Haven, N. Y.
St. Paul's,	Williams,	July 1,	Central Village, Conn.
St. Paul's,	Potter, H.	Sept. 4,	Centreville, N. Y.
St. Paul's,	Potter, A.	Sept. 16,	Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.
St. Stephen's,	Burgess,	Aug. 27,	Portland, Maine.
St. Thomas,	Burgess,	June 26,	Camden, Maine.
——— ———,	Meade,	June 20,	Campbell Court House, Va.

OBITUARY.

DIED, suddenly, on Saturday, 19th of July, at La Porte, Indiana, the Rev. WALTER E. FRANKLIN, Rector of St. Paul's Church, in that village. His funeral took place on Tuesday, 22d, at his parish church. The funeral service was performed by the Right Rev. the Bishop of the Diocese, assisted by the Rev. Messrs. Bingham, Hudson, and Bruce.

In a letter from Bishop Upfold, communicating this painful intelligence, he says: "The family of Mr. Franklin, his parish, and the Diocese, have sustained a severe bereavement. I mourn the loss of one of the most faithful, devoted, and reliable of my clergy."

The Vestry of St. Thomas' Church, Newark, (Del.,) of which Mr. Franklin was the first Rector, and where he labored for seven years, esteemed and beloved by all who knew him, on learning of his death, met and passed appropriate resolutions of respect to his memory, and directed the chancel of their Church to be draped in mourning for the space of three months.

DIED, on Tuesday, June 17, at Bloomfield, Conn., the Rev. RANSOM WARNER, for many years Rector of St. Andrew's Church, in that place.

We quote from the Calendar:—

"Mr. W. was born in Waterbury in 1796, educated at Seabury College, (as Cheshire Academy was then called,) and ordained deacon by the Right Rev.

Bishop Brownell in 1822, and priest in 1823. Soon after his ordination he took charge of the parish of Simsbury and Granby, in which, though having much to discourage and dishearten him, he remained, with a brief exception of three years, (from 1834 to 1837,) until his death, (June 17th, aged 60.) During the three years mentioned he had charge of St. John's Church, East Windsor or Warehouse Point. The parish of Granby was resigned a few years since, upon the building up of the new parish at Tariffville, and that of Bloomfield a few weeks before his death; which, though it had seemed approaching for some time, came suddenly at last. He was present at the Convention on Wednesday, the 11th, and died on Tuesday, the 17th. His funeral was attended at the church by an immense concourse of people, the services in the church being conducted by the Rev. Prof. Jackson, Rev. Messrs. Bates and McClory, and a sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. Willey, from the words, 'I am the resurrection and the life,' etc. The services at the grave were by Prof. Jackson. How true is it, that in the midst of life we are in death; and that we know not what a day may bring forth."

Died, on the 21st of August, at the residence of his father-in-law, Silas Camps, Esq., in Jackson, Michigan, the Rev. William F. Bryant, late Rector of Trinity Church, Covington, Kentucky. The Rector of the Church of the Atonement, Philadelphia, where the late Mr. Bryant was, for a brief period, assistant minister, thus sketches his character:

"But a few weeks ago, by a notice published in this paper, we were informed of the change of residence determined upon by our lamented brother. From letters then received by his friends, he was known to be in the full possession of the strength of manhood, yet, to-day, it becomes our melancholy duty to record his death. His earthly ministry has ceased; and he has, ere this, rendered an account of his stewardship. We have not the shadow of a doubt upon our minds of the character of that rendering. As a minister of Christ, our departed brother was faithful. Deeply conscientious in the discharge of his duties, he had but a single eye to the will and interests of his Master. As a preacher, although destitute of brilliancy, he was always instructive, logical and clear, exhibiting a warmth and earnestness that proved his heartfelt desire for the salvation of his hearers. At Locke's Mills, at Mullica Hill, where he was settled, and in the Parish of the Church of the Atonement, of which he was for a year an assistant, has he left many friends; in their memories he will be treasured as a true Christian, a kind friend, and a faithful preacher of Christ. About fifteen years ago, the father of the deceased, (who was also a minister of our Church,) was struck with paralysis while upon his knees, closing the Prayer-meeting at the Church of the Epiphany, of this city. A few hours of helplessness closed his faithful ministry. And now, by a call more sudden and unexpected, was the son summoned into the Master's presence. None who knew the venerable father and the pious son, can for a moment doubt, that now together they are singing the song of Moses and the Lamb!

"In the thirty-fourth year of his age, and ninth of his ministry, has our brother been called to his rest. 'Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour when the Son of man cometh,' is the solemn warning, which, from the distant prairies of Michigan, where our brother's body now reposes, is borne to all who minister at God's altar, and to 'all who name the name of Christ!'"

The Rev. Paul Trapier Gervais died at Charleston, South Carolina, July 28th, 1856, in the 72d year of his age.

The *Southern Episcopalian* says:—

"Our departed brother was the senior Presbyter of this Diocese. He was ordained deacon, on the 25th of November, 1807, at New York, by Bishop Benjamin Moore, and Priest on the 4th of August, 1809. In 1810 he settled on John's Island, and officiated as a Minister of the Gospel. The parish had been for

rs without a Rector, and was without an Episcopal place of wor-
services of our Church were performed in the Presbyterian church,
kindly loaned for the purpose, and sometimes in private houses.
e exertions of Mr. Gervais, the parishioners were induced, in 1817,
John's Church, and Mr. G. was unanimously elected their Rector.
, however, permitted to labor long in the high and holy duties of his
disease of the chest compelled him, in May, 1818, to desist from
and he has never been able since that time to enter the pulpit. His
the concerns of his parish never, however, abated; and he was ena
der it very efficient aid as the Secretary and Treasurer of the Ves-
prudent management it is owing that the parish has now a compe-
or the support of its Rector, and that its temporal affairs are in a
uliar prosperity.
as it only to his own neighborhood that Mr. Gervais rendered valua-
In the Convention and the Standing Committee of the Diocese, and
ety for the Advancement of Christianity in South Carolina, his coun-
rays listened to with respect. He was one of the framers of the Con-
f the Diocese, and the last surviving founder of the society above
its Board of Trustees he has always had a place, and at the time of
illed the place of Vice President. He is the last of the original foun-
e Charleston Bible Society, and his name will be found among its
of Managers.
ore than a year past Mr. Gervais' health has been declining, and the
ction experienced last winter, in the loss of a devoted wife, seemed to
the general decay of his faculties. With his usual calmness he made
parations for his departure, and, with a humble hope in the merits of
ner, went peacefully to his rest.
neral took place at St. Philip's Church, where he had long been a wor-
Tuesday afternoon, July 29th; the Rev. Mr. Campbell performing
s, and a large number of the Clergy and Laity being present to honor
y of one who was generally esteemed in the community of which he
g been a member."

in the *Southern Episcopalian* the following reference to the death of
Clergy, but with no particulars as to time or place. No account of
s seems to have been given in any of the Church journals.
ve seen no notice, in any of our Church papers, of the death of the
. Gahagan, of the Diocese of Georgia. Having known the deceased,
to record our sense of his loss, and to rescue from oblivion some traits
racter which are worthy of imitation.
ahagan was born of parents in limited circumstances, and, while yet
uth himself, opened and conducted successfully a school, in order that
obtain means to enter college. While at the University of Georgia
ted himself with the Episcopal Church, in Athens, then under the
Rev. Dr. Stevens, now of Philadelphia. Here his thoughts were led
nistry; he entered the Virginia Seminary, and after due preparation
dained. Returning to Georgia, he labored in his native State, with a
absence, till his death. Mr. Gahagan could have been scarcely
rs of age. His last charge was the Church in Talbottom, Ga. The
nce of this young man, in his efforts to obtain an education, his kind-
mother, sister and younger brother, who were dependent upon him,
s worthy to be had in remembrance, while the fact that he was a na-
eorgia, and possessed qualifications which fitted him to labor to ad-
n that Diocese, lead us to regret his early death."

; Cape Palmas, Africa, on Easter Day, March 23, 1856, Mrs. VIRGINIA
FFMAN, wife of Rev. C. C. Hoffman. The Cavalla Messenger for March
following particulars:
HOFFMAN was born in Glastenbury, Connecticut, October 14th, 1832;

was married at Norfolk, Va., September 5th, 1850; arrived at Cape Palmas, February 10th, 1851; left for America on a visit, July 10th, 1854; returned to Cape Palmas, July 1st, 1855; and died March 23d, 1856.

"Not quite *twenty-four* years, therefore measured the earthly sojourn of our sister, and little more than *five* her missionary career. And yet if 'that life is long, which answers life's great end,' those who knew her, will have no hesitation in accounting the life of our departed friend long, as they will delight to treasure the remembrance of her short missionary course, as most honorable and blessed.

"From the time of her conversion, which took place not more than eighteen months before she became a missionary, her religious views appear to have been peculiarly clear and her Christian character most decided. Salvation through faith in Christ alone, was her hope and joy; and unwearied consecration of her life to His service the standard of her duty.

"It was with such views that she gave herself, in the bloom of youth and health, to the work of God in Africa. And all who knew her delight to testify that her views underwent no change, and her zeal only increased to the last. And how peaceful, how blessed her last end was, the following record from her bereaved, but through faith rejoicing husband will show.

"'She contracted a cold in October, of last year, at Rocktown, which led to *consumption*, of which she died.

"'Owing to great oppression she was unable to lie down the night previous to her death, and was supported by pillows in bed, until five o'clock, when she sat in a rocking chair. I was by her side, and repeated to her texts of Scripture and portions of hymns, which refreshed and strengthened her soul. She was perfectly conscious, and felt that her end was near.

"'I sent for the doctor, to whom, on arrival, she said, 'doctor, how soon shall I go?' He replied, 'it will not be long.' She was glad, smiled sweetly, and said to him, 'doctor, *you* have been kind to me, but *Jesus* kinder.'

"'I said, 'D—, is your trust in Him?' '*In Him alone*,' she replied, with firmness and a smile. At times her pain was great, and she said, 'Oh! agony! *Father, take thy child.* Husband, pray for my release. Thy will be done. But oh! the flesh is weak.' Again, in her pain, 'It is so wearisome; but I will bear it;' and smiles mingled with these expressions of submission to her Father's will. At a later period she said, 'I do not suffer.'

"'I asked if she had any message for dear Die, (Miss Dickson?) With a smile she answered, 'Love, to all at Cavalla, and Annie," (Smith.)

"'I asked have you any regret for coming to Africa? (Not that I thought she had, but to receive her dying testimony.) With a smile almost of scorn at the idea, she partly turned her head towards me and said, "Oh! no. Never!'

"'As her dissolution approached, I asked, 'Is all well?' 'Yes, *joy*," sweetly smiling.

"'Afterwards I asked the same, and with a smile she answered, 'yes;—'Love to the Bishop——of our work—the Lord reigneth,' as if she was thinking of the fewness of our number. 'Love, to Miss Alley,' who was away at the moment.

"'I said, 'farewell, blessed one,' when putting her lips to mine she kissed me.

"'She had felt some fear of 'the pains of death,' but the Lord was very gracious to her, and caused her to fall into a deep sleep, three quarters of an hour before she breathed her last, and so she fell asleep in Jesus. So quietly, that it was scarcely known when the spirit took its flight. Glory to God!'"

"So fades the summer cloud away,
So sinks the storm when gales are o'er,
So gently shuts the eye of day,
So dies the wave along the shore."

"She was buried at Mt. Vaughan, March 24th, Rev. G. W. Gibson and the Bishop performing the services."

HOW THE METHODISTS REGARD BAPTISM.

At the late General Conference of the Methodists, among other important subjects of discussion and formal action, was the Nature of Infant Baptism, and the relation of baptized children to the Church. It seems there was felt to be a necessity of such a recall of Methodists to first principles. The following is a summary of Methodist opinion in their own language. It recognizes the Church membership of such baptized children, and that they are to be regarded and treated as candidates for full communion. This is sound doctrine.

"1. *The relation of the child to the economy of grace* is stated as the ground of his relation to the Church. This is a dogmatic feature of the law; legal prescriptions should not usually be embarrassed with dogmatic statements; but it was deemed desirable by the conference that the theological truth which underlies the rite of infant baptism should be distinctly presented, as much vagueness is supposed to prevail among our people on the subject. The law, therefore, assumes that 'all children are, by virtue of the unconditional benefits of the atonement, placed in a state of grace, and are therefore morally entitled to the benefits of baptism.' The right of the child to baptism, it will be perceived, is not founded upon any assumption of natural innocence, but the relation he is placed in toward God by the 'unconditional benefits of the atonement.'

"The relation of the child, thus baptized, to the Church is then defined by the new law. It pronounces that as all such children are 'placed in visible covenant relation to God,' they should be 'under the *special care and supervision of the Church*.'

"Having defined the dogmatic basis of infant baptism, and the evangelical and ecclesiastical *status* of the baptized child, the law proceeds to prescribe the practical course to be taken, in order to secure to the baptized child the advantages of its new relation to the Church.

"(1.) The preacher in charge is required to keep a baptismal register, noting the parentage, residence, birth, and baptism of the child.

"(2.) The duty of *instructing* the child respecting the nature and obligation of its baptism, &c., is enjoined.

"(3.) He is to be allowed and encouraged to attend class-meeting.

"(4.) At the suitable age, when giving 'evidence of a desire to flee the wrath to come,' his name is to be placed upon the list *of probationers;* and, after the usual trial, he is to be *received into full communion* with the Church, on the usual conditions.

"(5.) Whenever a baptized child shall, by orphanage or otherwise, become deprived of Christian guardianship, the preacher in charge is to *ascertain and report* to the society or the leaders' meeting, the facts in the case, and such provision is to be made for the Christian training of the child as the circumstances of the case admit and require."

PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM IN MASSACHUSETTS.

We take the following (phraseology and all) from our exchanges:

It is a curious fact, that a very large portion of the oldest Churches in Massachusetts are of the Unitarian faith. For example: The First and Second Churches in Boston; First, Second, and Third in Roxbury; First in Dorchester, Plymouth, Salem, Charlestown, Milton, Quincy, (formerly Braintree,) Hingham, Scituate, Brighton, Watertown, Cambridge, Beverly, Chelsea, Medford, Dedham, Concord, Lexington, Gloucester, and many others which might be named. These are all descendants of the Puritans or Independents.

The First Church of Plymouth, (mentioned above,) is claimed to be the oldest in this country, excepting, perhaps, there may be one in Jamestown, Va., of which there appears no reliable account.

CALVIN'S GENEVAN CHURCH, NOW UNITARIAN.—It is singular, though true, that the Church in Geneva, in which John Calvin, who, in the sixteenth century,

was the cause of Servetus being burned at the stake for his alleged Unitarian heresies, is now, and has been for many years, occupied by a Unitarian congregation.

Accessions to the Unitarian Ranks in England.—The English Unitarians have lately received three conspicuous accessions to their ranks, viz: John Panton Hume, Wm. Forster and John Baxling, all of them converts from "orthodox" dissenters.

The Unitarian Festival.—A pretty good thing was said among the Unitarians at their customary Annual Festival, held at Faneuil Hall. Mr. Francis E. Parker, of Boston, was called upon to respond in behalf of the Society. He said that religion was so confused in Boston that it had become really difficult to ascertain whether a man believed in anything firmly enough to entitle him to swear in a Court of Justice; and then he told this story: A witness here in Boston was called upon to testify before a magistrate. He was questioned as to his belief: "Your Honor," was the answer, "I am a free thinking Roman Catholic." And this was like another case: An Israelite was called as a witness, but before giving testimony addressed the Court after this wise: "How shall I swear—I am an American citizen, born of Hebrew parents, *and I go to Theodore Parker's meeting!*" It has got to be, true enough, a hard case to tell what religion a man has who steps out of the ranks of Orthodoxy here in the East. Rev. Mr. Conway, of Washington City, was called out to respond to a toast in honor of his Church. Hon. Thomas D. Eliot, of New Bedford, made a brief address. There were upwards of eight hundred persons at table.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF THE RIGHT REV. DR. ARMSTRONG, BISHOP OF GRAHAMSTOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.

In our April No., 1854, we gave an account of the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Armstrong to the newly formed Colonial Bishopric, and some account of the man himself. We are now obliged to record his death, which took place May 16, 1856, at the age of 42 years. He died with the harness on, literally worn out with hard work. The Bishop was born at Bishopwearmouth, England, August 22, 1813. He lost his father at the age of sixteen. Was educated at Charter House School. He was then Crewe Exhibitioner at Lincoln College, Oxford. Took his degree of B. A., with honors, in 1836. He was soon after ordained deacon on a curacy in Somersetshire, and subsequently priest. He was afterwards curate of Clifton, and in 1841 was elected priest-vicar of Exeter Cathedral, and soon afterwards Saint's-day preacher in that cathedral. In 1843, he was presented to the rectory of St. Paul's, in the same city. Married on the 22d February, in the same year, Frances, eldest daughter of Edward Whitmore, Esq. About this time his first paper was published in the *British Critic*. He also contributed several articles to the *Christian Remembrancer* and *English Review*. He was now a chief instrument in forming a society for the cultivation

of Church music and a literary and scientific institute, which rapidly attained success. He was also an active member of the agricultural society in that city. In October, 1845, he exchanged livings with the Rev. J. H. S. Barr, vicar of Tidenham, Gloucestershire, to which he then removed. Soon after began the great work of his English life—the reform of the female penitentiary system, begun by an article in the *Quarterly*, followed up by subsequent articles on the same subject, resulting in an entirely new system—the distinguishing feature of which is, that the penitents are under the care of unpaid gentlewomen, instead of paid matrons. He still found time for the efficient discharge of his duties as a parish priest. Two schools, used also as chapels, in outlying parts of the parish, and a church, remain as monuments of his zeal at Tidenham. The *Tracts for the Christian Seasons*, edited by him, and published by Parker of Oxford, began in 1849, and met with surprising success. They were followed by a second series, equally successful. Then began the *Parochial Tracts*, and (while these were going on) the *Sermons for the Christian Seasons*, all eminently successful. He had embarked on another literary work, when he was designated Bishop of Grahamstown, and consecrated on St. Andrew's day, 1853, at the parish church of Lambeth. During his short Episcopate, Bishop Armstrong had established and *filled* a Grammar School, begun a Diocesan College, and set going the great work of training *on the spot* a ministry for his diocese.

DEATH OF THE LATE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

Died, on Friday, June 6th, Dr. James Henry Monk, Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Deceased was the only son of Mr. Charles Monk, an officer of the 49th Regiment, and he was born at Buntingford, Herts, early in the year 1784. His early education he received at Norwich, under the Rev. Dr. Forster, but was removed thence to the Charterhouse in 1798. Here he remained nearly three years. He was transferred to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was entered as a pensioner, and went into residence in October, 1800. After a career of considerable distinction as scholar, tutor, professor, preacher, he was, on the recommendation of the late Duke of Wellington, in 1830, promoted to the Episcopate of Gloucester, and in 1836, Bristol was annexed to his See.

"Dr. Monk's name is best know to the literary world in general by his *Life of Bentley*, which he published in 1830 in two goodly volumes quarto. He was also the author of several tracts, sermons, and charges on ecclesiastical subjects, and of a *concio ad clerum* preached before Convocation in St. Paul's Cathedral some thirty years ago.

The political part which Dr. Monk took in the Upper House has been by no means a prominent one; he usually contented himself with giving a silent vote in favor of the Tory interest. In religious matters, though a sound and attached Churchman, he observed a safe and cautious line; his favor, however, was generally shown to the High Church rather than to the Evangelical party, whose influence at Bristol, Clifton, Cheltenham, and other places in his diocese, occasionally proved to him a source of discomfort. He could be firm, however, as he showed when, in 1841, he severely censured Mr. Williams' *Tract for the Times*, on "Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge;" he also presented a respectful protest to her Majesty against the proposed appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. He steadily supported the demand for the revival of Convocation. To all works of charity he contributed largely, and for many years regularly devoted a tithe of his income to the augmentation of small livings in his diocese. He contributed, also considerable sums towards the restoration of churches, the building of parsonages, and of parochial and diocesan schools. For many years before his death he was a sufferer from partial blindness, which of late years he felt to be a sad impediment to him in the discharge of his Episcopal duties, and for the last six months he had suffered under almost total prostration of the physical energies."

This brief sketch of his life and character we gather from the English Church press.

CONSECRATION OF TWO BISHOPS.

On Sunday morning, August 10th, Right Rev. Charles Baring was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and Right Rev. Henry J. C. Harper, Bishop of Christ Church, New Zealand, in the Archbishop's private chapel at Lambeth. The Primate was assisted on the occasion by the Bishops of Winchester, Chichester and Oxford. Prayers were read by Rev. John Thomas, the Archbishop's Chaplain, and the sermon preached by the Rev. J. H. Gurney, from 2 Tim. ii, 1, 2. The new Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol is a younger brother of the late First Lord of the Admiralty, Sir Francis Baring, and graduated B. A. at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1829, as a double first class. He officiated for some time as curate of St. Ebbe's Church, in Oxford, and was appointed to the Rectory of All Soul's, Langham Place, on the resignation of the Rev. Dr. Chandler, Dean of Chichester. The new Bishop was born in 1807, and is married to a daughter of the late Thomas Read Kemp, Esq., M. P. for Lewes. His sister was the first wife of the Right Hon. Henry Labouchere, M. P. He is said to belong to the extreme Low Church School.

Bishop Harper's Diocese includes the new settlement of Canterbury, the southern island of New Zealand, and all adjacent islands lying to the southward of 43 degrees 5 min. south latitude. Thus is added another Colonial Bishop.

Consecration of the Bishop of Carlisle.—At the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, the Hon. and Rev. Montagu Villiers, D. D., was consecrated to the Bishopric of Carlisle. The consecrating Prelates were the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Manchester, Ripon, and Chester. At the close of the morning service, which was read by the Rev. J. H. Howlett, the sermon was preached by the Rev. Robert Bickersteth, M. A., Canon of Salisbury, and Rector of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields. The Rev. gentleman took as his text St. Luke xii, 42, 43. The Bishop, who is a brother of the Earl of Clarendon, and a brother-in-law of Sir G. C. Lewis, will not be entitled to a seat in the House of Lords until a vacancy arises in a See other than Canterbury, York, London, Durham, or Winchester. His lordship has appointed Mr. Lee, of Queen Anne's Bounty Office, to be his secretary.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

We have frequently alluded to the constantly deteriorating character of Parliament as a Church legislative body, and to the consequent peril of the Church's best interests.

At the late Session, the *Marquis of Blanford* put the question to the Premier, "whether, in consequence of the state of health of several of the prelates of the Church, who were unhappily disabled from attending to their dioceses, it was the intention of the Government to take any steps to put in force the powers of the Act 26th of Henry VIII, chap. 14. 'for the nomination and consecration of suffragans within this realm;' or, if not, whether the subject was still one which had occupied the attention of her Majesty's Government with a view to providing a suitable remedy?" "Upon this the Bishops were of course bearded as usual. Mr. *Hadfield* said, "Their presence in another place was one of the most painful circumstances connected with his Parliamentary duties. He could not tell of what use the Bishops were in the other house, for he was sure that there never was a measure connected with the freedom and the welfare of the country which they had not opposed."

SEPARATION OF THE BISHOPRICS OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

The *Earl of Ellenborough* on Monday, called the attention of the Government to the vacancy occasioned by the death of Bishop Monk, and to the prospect of now disuniting the two Sees.

Lord Redesdale thought it impossible for any clergyman to carry on the duties of the extended See of Gloucester and Bristol, in the manner in which they ought to be performed. The union of Gloucester and Bristol was effected at a time when it was determined that the number of Bishops should not be increased, and it was with that object that four Sees were united—viz, Bangor and St. Asaph, and Gloucester and Bristol—in order that the two new Sees of Manchester and Ripon might be created.

The "Oath of Adjuration" Bill, admitting Jews to Parliament, passed the Lower House on Monday, June 9th, by a vote of 159 to 110, but was defeated in the House of Lords by a vote of 110 to 78.

In the House of Lords the Bishop of Salisbury was taken to task on Thursday, June 3d, for refusing to consecrate a cemetery Chapel without an Altar, and *Lord Portman*, a Whig, indulged himself in vulgar sneers of the Bishop's prerogative.

On June 10th, a Bill for the Abolition of Capital Punishment was defeated in the Lower House by a vote of 158 to 64.

On Monday, June 7th, *Lord Redesdale* presented the petition from members of the Convocation of the province of York, showing that, while the clergy of the province of Canterbury have lately deliberated in Convocation, all opportunity of participating in such deliberations has been denied to the Convocation of the province of York, and praying the house, before proceeding with any measure specifically affecting the clergy, to "Address her Majesty, or otherwise procure that the same may be submitted to the clergy of both provinces in their Convocations now lawfully in being under the Royal Writs addressed to both Archbishops respectively."

On Thursday, *Lord Redesdale* presented a petition from the clergy of the rural deanery of Stowe, formerly in the diocese of Gloucester, complaining of the injury done by the union of the Sees of Bristol and Gloucester, and praying that the Sees might be again divided.

The Divorce and Matrimonial Bill has been withdrawn.

Government have determined to withhold hereafter the small pittance of £500 per annum, heretofore granted to the Scottish Episcopal Church. The present legal disabilities of the Scotch clergy it is promised to remove.

On the 10th of July, the Lord Chancellor introduced into the House of Lords, "an act to provide for the retirement of the present Bishops of London and Durham."

It was opposed by the Bishops of Oxford and Exeter, but passed on its third reading by a vote of 26 to 15, and the Lower House by a majorfty of 79, and has become a law.

The bill vacated the Sees on September 1st, (it is also provided that the two Bishops to cease to be entitled to sit in Parliament,) the Bishop of London to retain during life the palace at Fulham, and to receive a pension of £6,000 a year, and the Bishop of Durham one of £4,500; with other provisions.

The present Bishop of London was consecrated Bishop of Chester in 1824, and translated to the See of London in 1826, so that he will have enjoyed a tenure of thirty-two years of office. The Rt. Rev. Prelate is in his seventy-first year. Dr. Maltby, the retiring Bishop of Durham, was first consecrated Bishop of Chichester in 1821, and translated in 1836. The Rt. Rev. Prelate is in the eighty-seventh year of his age.

The disposal of such a matter by such a body of men, grates on the nerves of American Churchmen, and especially when we think of the disposal of such

posts of influence which will possibly be made. The objection to the Bill, on the ground of "Simony," with which it was met in the House of Lords, seems to us very senseless and very unjust. It is only to say that a See shall have no relief from a Bishop's incapacity, however great; or that no provision shall be made for his support if he retires from a position which he cannot fill. The Bishop's (of London) charities have been enormous.

Parliament was prorogued by the Queen on the 29th of July, until the 7th of October.

CHURCH-RATES.—The subject of Church-rates is becoming a standing topic of excitement among Dissenters, both in Parliament and out. Yet there seems little reason for it. In the vast majority of cases even the Dissenters have not been very eager in claiming exemption for themselves. The Parishes are about eleven thousand in number, and the Church-rate contest rages only in about five hundred, or one in twenty-two. In those Parishes where the rate is opposed, the contest is prosecuted with fearful virulence; but it would be obviously unfair to make the sentiments of one Parish, where Dissenters are numerous, the basis of legislation for twenty-two, in which they are but a handful, or have no footing at all.

LAY COÖPERATION IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

A late No. of the *London Guardian* has a remarkable article on this subject, from which we take the following detached sentences. Such sentiments from such a quarter are something new. It is a movement in the right direction, and, as American Churchmen, we bid it God speed.

"There is a pretty general feeling abroad that the time has come for a more organized system of lay coöperation in all matters that have to do with the practical efficiency of our Church. * * * * * * * *

"It may now be fairly assumed that the English Church enjoys an active Convocation, for be it remembered that the sanction of the Crown is by no means necessary to establish this fact. * * * * * * * *

"The general existence of Convocation does not in any way depend upon the granting or withholding of the express permission to deliberate.

"It being, then, an undoubted fact that Synodal action is a recognized feature of the English Church, the question remains, how can we best bring to bear the general voice of the Church upon her Synodical deliberations? Convocation itself, as it is assembled in the Jerusalem Chamber, is certainly not in a state to admit at present of a lay element. * * * * * * * *

"The better, the more practical course in obtaining the popular coöperation of the Church's lay members, is, we believe, to begin from below. Lay influence must be a representative one, or it can never stand, and the highest sphere of its operation as such, towards which at present we can see our way, is that of coöperation in diocesan Synods. * * * * * * * *

"Thus much for each Parish, and now for a further step. The parochial Synod would annually appoint one of its numbers to be its representative in the diocese, who should attend ruri-decanal and diocesan Synods with the clergy, or even archi-diaconal ones, if (to adopt the appropriate phraseology of archdeacons) these laymen could be persuaded 'to undergo such a visitation;' or rather, if these gatherings of the clergy could be made in any way useful, and not a mere legal form.

"The American Church, and our own Church in Canada, is setting a most worthy example of lay coöperation; and if at home we are to have any extended revival of Church action on the masses of our people, something of the kind should be systematically attempted here."

Such an introduction of the lay element, besides calling out the active sympathies of the laity, would also prepare the way for that free and unhampered position which the Church must take sooner or later. We need not say it is also Scriptural and primitive. In the American Church the plan works admirably.

COADJUTOR BISHOPS IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

The papers, in reply to Mr. Gladstone's motion for correspondence relative to the Church affairs of the Diocese of Jamaica, supply some interesting information, not only in regard to the recent appointment of a suffragan Bishop for that Diocese, but also in respect to suffragans in general. On the 28th of May, 1855, the Bishop of Jamaica communicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury, by whom the letter was forwarded to Lord John Russell, his desire to resign his office, if one-third of his salary as a pension, leaving £2,000 for his successor, was secured to him; the certificates of his medical attendants stating that the Bishop could not return to the tropics without serious risk to his life. The whole matter having been referred to the Colonial Secretary, to the Queen's Advocate, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the arrangement has been carried out, and Archdeacon Courtenay has been named for the office.

The correspondence closes with the following list of Suffragans consecrated since the Reformation:—

1533—September 13, Thomas Woolff, Lacedemon, London.

1535—March 19, John Salisbury, Thetford, Norwich.

1536—Thomas Sparke, died 1572, Berwick, Durham: October 20, William More, assisted at the consecration of Finch of Taunton, 1538, Colchester, Ely.

1537—June 28, John Bird, afterwards Bishop of Bangor and Chester, Penrith, Carlisle; June 28, Lewis Thomas, assisted at the consecration of Kitchen at Llandaff, Shrewsbury, St. Asaph; November 4, Thomas Morley, assisted at the consecration of Bradley of Shaftesbury, Marlborough, Sarum; December 9, Richard Yngworth, assisted at the consecration of Knight of Bath and Wells, Dover, Canterbury; John Hodgkins, assisted at fourteen consecrations, Bedford, Ely; Henry Holbeck, afterwards Bishop of Rochester and Lincoln, Bristol, Worcester.

1538—April 7, William Finch, Taunton, Bath and Wells.

1539—March 23, John Bradley, Shaftesbury, Sarum; Robert King, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, Roan, Sarum; March 15, Robert Sylvester, Hull, York.

1553—Robert Pursglove, died 1579, Hull, York.

1566—March 9, Richard Barnes, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle and Durham, Nottingham, Lincoln.

1569—May 15, Richard Rogers, Dover, Canterbury.

1592—November 12, John Sterne, Colchester, Ely.

In no case on record did a Suffragan succeed to the Diocese in which he had acted as coadjutor.

1836—G. Jehosaphat Mountain, at present Bishop of Quebec, having succeeded to the possession of the Diocese by appointment of the Crown on the decease of Bishop Stewart in 1837, Montreal, Quebec.

An Act of Parliament was passed in 1812, 52 Geo. III, c. 62. relating to the appointment of coadjutor Bishops in Ireland, but it appears, since the passing of that Act, no coadjutor Bishops have hitherto been appointed in that country.

DITCHER *vs.* DENISON.—THE ARCHBISHOP'S DECISION.

This important case has at length been concluded. It commenced on Tuesday, the 22d of July, and continued throughout the week. The inquiry was conducted by the Archbishop of Canterbury in person, assisted by Dr. Lushington and the Dean of Wells, Mr. Johnson, who acted as his Grace's assessors. The case was argued also by the counsel who were engaged in the late Knightsbridge case. Dr. Phillimore appearing for the Archdeacon, and Dr. Bayford for his accusers.

The line of defense was, in the main, not the truth of the opinions charged, but that they have been held by such men as Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Wilson, and a long catena of our best and most learned divines.

MISCELLANEOUS.

As is seen under our Parliamentary news, the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Durham are both compelled to retire from active duties by physical infirmities, and are to have coadjutors, or as we say, assistant Bishops. The retiring pension proposed to be given to Dr. Blomfield is reported to be £6,000 a year; that intended for Dr. Maltby, £4,500 a year. Of Bishop Maltby we know little, and will say nothing. Bishop Blomfield has earned as a scholar a lasting reputation. In the work of Church extension in the colonies *twenty-one* new dioceses attest his deep interest; while at home he has contributed to the erection of over *two hundred* new Churches in his own diocese. In all respects his Episcopate has been an efficient one, and he now retires with a well-earned reward of honor and gratitude.

The following table exhibits at a glance the geographical, and numerical size, and clerical force of the Church in England.

Dioceses in England.—Capitular Commissioners' first report, page 40:

Dioceses.	Population.	Acres.	Benefices.	Curates.
London,	2,558,718	246,157	324	258
Manchester,	1,395,494	845,904	317	140
Chester,	1,066,124	1,630,988	436	158
Winchester,	1,080,412	1,598,568	523	285
Ripon,	1,033,457	1,567,793	410	142
Lichfield,	1,022,080	1,740,607	536	154
Exeter,	922,656	2,530,780	657	166
York,	764,538	2,261,493	534	205
Worcester,	752,376	1,037,451	417	199
Durham,	701,381	1,906,835	245	106
Lincoln,	677,649	2,302,814	797	309
Norwich,	671,583	1,994,525	910	364
Rochester,	577,298	1,535,450	564	240
Gloucester and Bristol,	538,109	1,000,503	442	189
Oxford,	503,042	1,385,779	584	—
Ely,	482,412	1,357,765	529	191
Peterborough,	465,671	1,240,327	536	184
Bath and Wells,	424,492	1,043,059	462	213
Canterbury,	417,099	914,170	352	166
Salisbury,	379,296	1,309,617	449	196
Chichester,	336,844	934,851	311	128
Hereford,	216,143	986,244	358	98
Carlisle,	372,306	901,052	137	28

Statistics of the Scottish Church.—[*From the Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal.*]—The possession of a body of recently collected statistics, obtained for this Journal by the kind assistance of the Clergy, and presented in detail last month as our "Clergy List and Ecclesiastical Table" for 1856, naturally prompts an attempt to analyze the information which has been furnished to us and to generalize its results—so far at least as the subject admits of these processes. We trust that our readers will be compensated for the dryness incident to all questions of figures by the very interesting nature of the topic to which our present calculations relate, and by the brevity which our limits impose upon us.

The Scottish branch of the Church Catholic contains within her borders, it appears, in the Year of Grace 1856, 157 churches and chapels, and 166 clergy of all orders.

Of the former, 69 are consecrated buildings. The diocese of Aberdeen contains 25 churches and chapels—16 being consecrated; the diocese of Edinburg,

and in the

in English

and in the

Scottish,

English.

of all in

number of foreign clergy

We have the

We find the largest

and clergy with that

in May, 1851,

in January, 1856, we

The number of native clergy

in the dioceses of Argyll and

a subject of honest

at the Altar of our

of the several branches

the world. Let our English

them say whether it be

restrictions which

will in their own is in

parsonages through-

that a third of the

we trust that a general

the number of

think that the present

as formerly, it ap-

for congratulation.

with the clergy, the parson-

They have but one parson-

nearly one parsonage for

than one for every second

clergyman; and in St.

clergyman. It is evident,

must, in order to be effec-

that any that have yet been made.

pleasing grounds for contem-

day schools for the education of the

has been nearly doubled since 1851

The advance has taken place in

there are 18 schools—more than

Edinburgh also 18, nearly double

instead of 12;

in Brechin, 21 instead of 12;

Moray, 7—an increase of more than double;

and in St. Andrews 11 instead of 7.

In 88 churches or chapels—about one-fourth of the whole number—daily service is celebrated; thus distributed:—10 in Aberdeen, 9 in St. Andrews, 5 in Brechin, 4 in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Moray respectively, 1 in Argyll, and 1 in Trinity College Chapel. There is a weekly celebration of Holy Communion in 15 churches or chapels—about 1 in 10 of the whole number—viz., in 3 in the dioceses of Edinburgh and St. Andrews respectively; in 2 in each of the dioceses of Brechin, Glasgow and Moray; in 1 in each of the dioceses of Aberdeen and Argyll, and in Trinity College.

In 46 churches the Scottish Office is used exclusively in the celebration of the Holy Communion; in 5 both the Scottish and the English Offices are used; and in 88 the English Office is used exclusively. In 17 instances we have no information upon this point—they are, however, chiefly cases of private chapels or mission stations, where the communicants go to a neighboring church upon Communion Sundays. In the diocese of Aberdeen, the Scottish Office is used in 18 places, the English in 4, and both Offices in 1; in Edinburgh, the Scottish in 1, the English in 17, and both in 1; in Argyll, the Scottish in 3, and the English in 11; in Brechin, the Scottish in 6, and the English in 8; in Glasgow, the Scottish in 2, and the English in 28; in Moray, the Scottish in 4, the English in 11, and both in 2; in St. Andrews, the Scottish in 12, and the English in 9; and in Trinity College, both Offices are used.

In 1851, the Scottish Office was exclusively used in 40 places, the English exclusively in 85 places, and both Offices in 2. The dioceses in which the use of the Scottish Office has increased are in Edinburgh, Argyll, Glasgow, Moray, and St. Andrews. Those who agree with us in thinking that, in the alternate or occasional use of *both* Offices, is to be found the most catholic practice, as well as the best safeguard against uncharitable differences and erroneous doctrine, on either side, respecting the Holy Sacrament, will be pleased to observe that while in 1851 there were only *two* congregations in Scotland which used both our venerable Offices, there are now five which have adopted this method.

The above short digest we trust may be found to have saved our most industrious readers some little trouble; while we may further fairly expect that others will thank us for doing for them what they might not have done for themselves.

BISHOP GOBAT IN ENGLAND.

At the annual meeting of the friends and subscribers to the Jerusalem Diocesan Fund, recently held in St. Martin's-hall, under the presidency of Lord Shaftesbury, *Bishop Gobat* attended, and gave a lengthened report of the mission at Jerusalem. Three points were discussed by the Bishop—his Mission among the Jews—the Eastern Christians—and the Abyssinians.

He stated that, of Jewish converts, although the number received in baptism is but small, being about five or six a year, making a total of about fifty since he has been in Jerusalem, only one person, that person being a woman, has returned to the Jews. He complains, however, that these converts lack "spontaneity of life and action;" they are obedient, but not forward to "prove that there is divine power working in their souls."

As to the Eastern Churches, he confesses to a change of the policy towards them which the English Church avowed in founding the Mission. He had once hoped, he says, "that there was a possibility of the Greek Church being reformed without being dismembered; but after a few months I came to the conclusion that there was not more hope of that Church than of the Church of Rome." Accordingly, to that view of the subject he has surrendered himself unreservedly; and he considers that it is the hand of Providence which has forced him to take this view. At first "he entered on this branch of his work tremblingly, not knowing how far he had liberty to advance;" and "until his last visit to this country, it was not his object to make proselytes from Christ-

ian Churches—at least, from the Greek Church." Now he does not hesitate to say that it is Providence has made it plain that he is bound to do so.

The Bishop seems to feel the comparative fruitlessness of his present work, and his mind turns to the scene of his earlier labors, Abyssinia. He says that after he left that country, from ill health, the Jesuits entered the country, and represented to the already jealous governor that the English missionaries had built a larger house than they required, intending it for an English governor, and that there was a danger of the English taking the country; the result of which was that the mission was arrested. Since that time I have received letters from Abyssinians, the writers of which appear to recollect conversations which I had with them more than twenty years ago, and invite me to return to their country. * * * * * * * * * * *

I thought some years ago, and I think still, that Abyssinia is the proper door to the interior of Africa, if we are to send the Gospel there, wherefore I would earnestly commend it to the prayers of all who have that object at heart.

We still think, and we are confirmed in this opinion by Bishop Gobat's statements, that Missions to the East should be conducted on the primitive basis of Order, as well as doctrine, and that the English Church have a right, and are under obligation, to carry such a Mission there *in its integrity*. Our views were given in the January *Church Review* for 1854, and by those views we still abide. That Bishop Gobat has abandoned the ground on which the Mission was established, is evident from "a statement of proceedings" relative to the establishment of the bishopric "published by authority." The following passage occurs in p. 6:

"While the Church of Rome is continually, and at this very moment (1841) laboring to pervert the members of the Eastern Churches, and to bring them under the dominion of the Pope, sparing no arts nor intrigues, hesitating at no misrepresentations, sowing dissensions and disorder amongst an ill-informed people, and asserting that jurisdiction over them which the ancient Churches of the East have always strenuously resisted, the two great Protestant Powers of Europe will have planted a Church in the midst of them, the Bishop of which is specially charged not to entrench upon the spiritual rights and liberties of those Churches, but to confine himself to the care of those over whom *they* cannot rightfully claim any jurisdiction; and to maintain with them a friendly intercourse of good offices, assisting them, *so far as they may desire such assistance*, in the work of Christian education; and presenting to their observation, but not forcing upon their acceptance, the pattern of a Church essentially Scriptural in doctrine, and apostolical in discipline."

It is said of the Anglican Bishop, (p. 7:)

"He will establish and maintain, as far as in him lies, relations of Christian charity with other Churches represented at Jerusalem, and in particular with the orthodox Greek Church, *taking special care to convince them that the Church of England does not wish to disturb, or divide, or interfere with them*, but that she is ready, in the spirit of Christian love, to render them such offices of friendship as they may be willing to receive."

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

We are glad to see that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have consented to issue annually addresses to the Clergy to supply the place of Queen's Letters. They have this year chosen the National Society as the subject of their recommendation. The fact that they have done so has stirred up a great deal of bile among certain party men, who seem to have calculated on the crippling of the energies of two Old Church institutions.

STRENGTH OF ROMANISM IN PARIS.

According to the report of his Diocese, made to Pius IX, by the Archbishop of Paris, and now published with considerable developments by one of his

Clergy, there exists at Paris 48 parochial churches for a population of 1,025,169 Roman Catholics—still far short, as the report remarks, of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when there were 40 parishes for 200,000 souls, or even before 1789, when there were 71 parish churches for 600,000 or 700,000. In addition to the parish churches there are in the diocese 27 public chapels, 50 private ones, and 157 oratories, where mass is performed by special authorization. The number of the secular priesthood who administer there is 890. There are, besides, in the diocese, 15 ecclesiastical communities of males, numbering about 1,000 *frères* and novices, and 48 religious communities of women, numbering about 3,800—altogether a *personnel* of 5,690 members of the ecclesiastical condition.

MONTALEMBERT AND LORD PALMERSTON.

M. de Montalembert has just caused to be reprinted an article from his pen, entitled, *Pius IX and Lord Palmerston*, which appeared in the *Correspondant* on the 25th of June last.

After solemnly warning that the display of a continual and persevering hostility to Rome will end, infallibly, in alienating the good understanding and alliance of a country so fundamentally Catholic as France, M. de Montalembert asks if it be possible that England is not aware of the general Continental hostility she is fermenting against herself. The letter is thoroughly Jesuitical in its tone and character, and is evidently designed to frighten Great Britain from sympathy with Free Institutions in their struggle against the aggressions of despotism.

IRISH CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

Notwithstanding the full reports of the success of Church Missions in Ireland, yet the bold denials of the Papists have led us to watch the subject with interest. At the late anniversary of the Society the Rev. S. Minton, who had lately been on a tour of inspection in Ireland, gave the results of his inquiry. After speaking of the wonderful and systematic efforts of the Romish priests to counteract the work, and of his own care to obtain exact information, he says: "He could unhesitatingly declare that the general verdict given was, that upon the whole the work was still progressing hopefully in Ireland, and that there was nothing whatever to damp the zeal or diminish the ardor of those who were engaged in it."

The (London) *Clerical Journal* says, that "at the late visitation tour of his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, his Grace made close inquiries on the subject of the Irish language, as to whether the Clergy residing in the Irish speaking districts made efforts to instruct their parishioners through the medium of their language, so dear to many of the Irish people. It is well to know that much is doing and has been done towards this desirable object by the instrumentality of the excellent Irish Society; and that many clergymen have commenced the study of the language, even in advanced life, like Bishop Bedell, who began the study of it in his sixtieth year. Nothing can be more deplorable, as Canon Wordsworth shows in his Sermons on the Irish Church, than the manner in which the two fundamental principles of the Reformation, viz, vernacular Scriptures and a vernacular Liturgy, seem to have been neglected or forgotten in Ireland. No edition of the Book of Common Prayer in Irish appeared before the year 1608, more than seventy years after the commencement of the Irish Reformation; and it was not till the year 1686, that is, a century and a half after the commencement of the Reformation, that the entire Scriptures, Old and New Testaments, were made accessible to the Irish in their own tongue."

We take this occasion to call attention to the Sermons of Canon Wordsworth, noticed above, as the most satisfactory history of the Irish Church which we have ever seen. At the present day especially it is of the greatest interest and value.

REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA.

We have before us President Benson's Inaugural Address. In it he enunciated the following principles as those upon which he will endeavor to administer the Government:—

1. That according to the solemn obligation soon to be administered to me, I will try and faithfully adhere to the Constitution and Laws of the Republic. I will also strive permanently to keep in view:
2. The encouragement of every branch of industry and avenue to national greatness—agriculture, commerce, mechanism, internal improvement, education, etc. etc.—by recommending such measures, from time to time, as will in my opinion enhance their interest, and as the state of the public finance will justify.
3. An avoidance of pecuniary embarrassment of the Government, unless circumstances should render a different course indispensable to our national existence, or the maintenance of the majesty of the laws.
4. The moral, intellectual, social, and political improvement of the Aborigines.
5. The cultivation of peace and harmony at home and abroad.
6. The observance of good faith and justice toward all nations.

The ship Elvira Owen sailed from Savannah on the 21st June, for Monrovia, Liberia. She carries out 321 emigrants. Of this large cargo of emigrants, nearly all were slaves, freed voluntarily by their owners, and in two cases furnished generously with money, to the aggregate amount of nearly $30,000, to give them a start in their future homes.

While Great Britain, France, Prussia, Belgium, Brazil, and Lubec, Bremen and Hamburg, have formally recognized Liberia as a State, and entered into political intercourse with her, the United States, which, for obvious reasons, should have preceded them all in the matter, have not yet followed their wise and just example. Already Great Britain is opening and establishing commercial relations with Liberia, which in the end will be as remunerating, as they are now important to the Republic. The country is rich in ivory, coffee, sugar, woods, &c., and contains nearly fifty millions of inhabitants. Mr. Gerald Ralston, in a letter from London, of June 26, 1856, speaks of the great increase of commerce between these two countries, England and Liberia, and of the great decrease of it between Liberia and the United States, particularly in the last two years; and the decrease is going on in a rapid ratio. He says, "When I was in Bristol ten days ago, I got a list of merchants of that port, who have no less than 54 ships engaged in the palm oil, and other trades of the African coast. The house of H. & Co. have 18 ships, B. D. & Co. have 12, L. & S. have 10, Mr. G. has 8, Mr. C. has 2, and Mr. R. has 2, W. & Co. have 8, Mr. L. has 2. These ships vary in size from 200 to 500 tons. So I could give you an enumeration of some 35 ships, (some of them even larger than 1000 tons burthen,) trading from Liverpool with the coast of Africa. These ships are independent of those that sail from London and other British ports, and I think it would not be difficult for me to enumerate 100 ships and steamers trading between these islands and the coast of Africa.

THE

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. IX. JANUARY, 1857. No. 4.

ART. I.—DISSENSIONS IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE, AND THEIR FINAL ADJUSTMENT.—No. I.

THAT brilliant but eccentric gentleman, Mr. Walter Savage Landor, suggested, some years since, the formation of a gallery to be filled with the likenesses of the great heroes of England, in the sphere of public life, of Literature, of the Drama, of Philosophy, of Natural Science, of the Arts, and of mechanical inventions. But from this Valhalla he proposed to exclude the great Theologians, on the ground that their works were chiefly controversial, having been called into Life through the exigencies of party warfare. It never seemed to have occurred to Mr. Landor, that all great achievements, all glorious unfoldings of Truth, are in some sort the product of conflict; are, in themselves, battles against existing falsehoods in the world of thought or belief. A Raphael, indeed, may be painting his cartoons and dreaming of the beautiful forms soon to be the delight of a world, while Titans are engaged in a war to end in the spiritual emancipation of men: a Goethe, to his shame, may have a song for every theme, save the Father-land, writhing in agony under the oppressor. Art moves in its own way and scarcely feels the common pulsations of the human heart. Its waters do not mingle with the common stream of History; they are fountains by the way side. Its Light shines and blazes apart, noticeable and grand, yet withal a Law unto itself. But the heroes of the race are they who fight its battles, and their thoughts are not so much of beauty, as of Truth, of righteousness, and of God. No great

right has been secured, no great blessing conferred, no great work done without toil, and weariness, and fight. The course of Empire, the growth of thought, the advance of knowledge—our revolutions, and our reformations, our very firesides are all, in some form or other, the prize and guerdon of battle. Battle is thus a potent factor in all History. By battle the world moves on. The causes and the men alike who occasion and produce it, do not challenge our admiration; on the contrary, they are condemned to infamy—bringing to light the worst aspects of human nature and its radical defect of sin. The Hero and deliverer comes after the Oppressor; and oppression must needs be sharp before his work can come to successful issues. So, also, the lover of Truth battles against error and falsehood. It is in resistance against wrong that the true hero reveals his qualities. The knight errant, on the other hand, armed cap-a-pie, going forth in quest of foes, is a mere fantastic being; and the keen dialectician, who challenges a world to dispute his Theses, is a mere knight errant. War having its origin, then, in wrongs done, in falsehoods spoken, in oppressions committed, is scarcely an amusement to the man who undertakes it. The undertaking is the sacrifice of personal ease, for truth and right against the wrong. It is a great mistake to suppose that the true hero seeks battle for the sake of battle. It is sheer necessity that compels him. It is well to bear this in mind in all our studies of History, and in our estimates of the men who occupy conspicuous places upon its pages.

These observations apply as well to the Christian religion and Church, as to the State and the Social life of man. From the time that Christianity first made its appearance among men, down to the present day, conflict has been one of the great elements of its Life and History. We may be weary of it, nevertheless against our will we are perpetually in the midst of it. We congratulate ourselves when one ugly issue is disposed of, still we are soon compelled to awaken to the realities of another. When the noise of strife is ringing in our ears, it pleases us to dream of times when warfare, within the Church, was unknown. Who has not heard Clergymen, while deploring our modern contentions, wax warm in their descriptions of the Primitive Age, and set it forth in glowing terms as free from the presence of party spirit? Is it not an old story to say of the Apostolic Age—*then* dissensions were unknown! Even Hegesippus, living in the second century, discourses of the matter like a nineteenth century clergyman.* Nor need

* Euseb. Hist. Bk. 3: c. 32.

this surprise us, since, even before his day, it was gravely said, that the Apostles were, before they were called by our Lord, "sinners above the rest of mankind."* The common notion upon this subject, it seems to us is, that the Church, in the Apostolic Age, suffered only from without—that Jew and Gentile sought, each in his own way, to crush her young life, while within the pale, holiness, love, and peace, held undisputed sway. We pronounce this, at the outset, a fiction. And we propose to set forth, in brief review, the truth of the matter, in the hope that the lessons to be gathered from the party dissensions in the Apostolic Age and their final adjustment, may not be lost upon us at this late hour of the world.

The wide-spread misconception of the actual condition of the primitive Apostolic Church, may be readily accounted for. It springs, we should say, from the knowledge that the Apostles themselves, guided and inspired by the Holy Ghost, were the teachers and pastors of the Church. It flows by way of inference from this fact. No motive has been present to the immense majority of men to start a question, or to raise a doubt respecting the extent of the influence wielded by the Apostles themselves. Then still farther, as part and parcel of the general notion, has been that firm perception upon the part of modern Christians, of the enormous, startling, *moral force*, which Christianity possessed and displayed in this period. Here are two facts, both of great significance in themselves, and certainly well fitted to lead men, without further thought, to the opinion, that this was the true Paradisaic Period of Christian History. This morning twilight rosy with Auroral splendors, embosomed in an atmosphere of divine love, is the point which has ever awakened the keenest delight and sympathy of Christian hearts. *We* find it a source of joy, not, however, because we suppose the Church then to have been what many fancy it, but because, amid storm and darkness, threatened from within, as well as persecuted from without, she held on her course freighted with truths and powers for the healing of the nations. As we read the history of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Age, it is not simply the divine supernatural revelation of redemptive grace and blessing, finding its way to benighted hearts with softest, gentlest tread, but it is a hand to hand conflict between the Spirit of God and the human soul, between truth and falsehood within men, between love and selfishness, and the final triumph of grace over nature. How can we ever lose sight of this fact? How can we sup-

* Barnabas Epistolae V, p. 9, Ed. Hefeb.

pose that God's truth, should, in that age of awful wickedness, have so triumphed over men's perversity as to have changed at once all individual peculiarities and to have converted every member of the Church into a noble saint—the very mirror of self-sacrifice and of charity? Christianity, though in itself the highest miracle *always*, is, nevertheless, in so far forth natural that it acts and has ever acted upon men according to their individual characteristics and peculiarities. Aye, through these, it has always addressed itself in manifold forms to the world. It converts the differences of temperament and of individual gifts into harmonious instrumentalities of good. The body of Christ, viewed as composed of "many members," is an organism embracing every type of human talent. When the Gospel of Christ gains possession of an individual, it does not forthwith blot out his personal traits, but leaves room for their display, and supplies motives for their noblest exercise. Being a moral, spiritual discipline, it wages warfare against the evil within him, while, in the modes of that warfare, as also in its results, the individuality of the believer is both preserved and developed. As now the power of Christian truth over an individual varies in the different periods of his own life, so, also, does it vary among individuals themselves. Its hold over myriads is feeble enough, while it comes in the fullness of blessing as light and strength to others. It has now, and it always has had, to contend with untold obstacles within the soul—with its old habits of sin, with its ignorance, in a word, with all its defects. Nor was the Apostolic Age, in any sense, an exception to this principle. By a reference, therefore, to the ingredients of which the Christian Communion was at first composed, it will be seen that internal conflict was inevitable, and, more than this, its character will be brought to light.

It is of course known to every one that the Ministry of the Lord Jesus was confined to the "lost sheep of the House of Israel." It is equally known to every reader of the New Testament, that the Apostles, as disciples or attendants upon the Lord in His Earthly Ministry, hoped for a "restoration of the kingdom unto Israel" in a carnal sense, quite at variance with the real objects of His Advent. The Resurrection may be said to have called Historic Christianity into life, while the Pentecostal gift was the inauguration of its divine power. Apostolic labor however was at first limited to the Jews, and to the last in fact, the original twelve were, in a special sense, the "Apostles of the Circumcision." True, tradition connects St. Peter's name with the Church and City of Rome, and Ephesus was beyond doubt the sphere of the latest labors of St. John, never-

theless even these are with the others commonly spoken of as ministers of (i. e. for) the Circumcision. At first, then, Christianity moved upon the soil of Judaism, and this not in any sense accidentally, but by divine appointment. Teachers and taught, Apostles and brethren alike were among the circumcised who had no thought of forsaking "the commandments and ordinances." They believed in the risen Jesus as the promised Messiah, nevertheless they remained firmly attached to the Law. They were not at this early date called upon to discuss the relation of the Law to the Gospel. They had no motive to advance beyond the exigencies of the moment. Their faith in Christ did not require them to break away from the observances to which they had been accustomed. Peter and John are seen going towards the Temple at the hour of prayer. All this is perhaps more important for a proper appreciation of the Church's posture at the outset of her course, than many persons suppose. Let it be borne in mind that the Jew believed in the divine origin and authority of the Law. In the Law and Prophets, in Holy Writ he found the promise of a Messiah to come. It was part of the covenant that Christ should come of the seed of Abraham. Consequently they who heard and received the witness of the Apostles respecting Jesus and His Messiahship could not be supposed to enter at once into the inexhaustible fullness and breadth of the redemptive blessing, nor foresee the unfoldings of the truth and the form of Christian life to be developed in the future. No great idea or law is ever grasped at once in all the fruitful and manifold ends to which it may lead. The faith in Christ was a present concrete fact, and became a law of life to those Jewish believers as Jews. They were not forsaking but realizing the covenant in their allegiance to Jesus. The Temple still stood; the Priesthood still offered sacrifices; the brethren repaired thither as of old, though its courts might be thronged with multitudes who rejected Jesus as the Messiah. Under its Jewish form the gospel spread. Thousands, not merely in Jerusalem but elsewhere, were received into the "company of the faithful." A great company of the priests even became obedient unto the faith. Apostles and brethren went forth preaching Jesus, and declaring that by Him, God would judge the world. They preached Him as the One Saviour—they set forth a truth which was itself, as we, *after* the event read it, a proclamation that the Law had passed away. Yet this fact does not appear to have presented itself to their minds as a definite, tangible reality. Even the Apostle Peter, although by his baptism of Cornelius he took the initiative in the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles into the Church, found

it necessary to explain the transaction to the brethren in Jerusalem. (Acts xi, 2, 3 seq.) So jealous were some at least at that time of anything like fraternization with the uncircumcised. More than this, St. Peter did not seem to regard the vision at Joppa and the baptism at Cæsarea as an intimation to go forth specifically beyond the Jews, in his labors. We may naturally conclude that the Jerusalem Church as such, certainly an influential party in it, still viewed the Law as in force, although they had as yet framed no theory respecting the universality of its claims. The "Gentile question" had not yet "come up." In differing degrees of zeal they were wedded to the Law, and at the same time rejoiced in Christ as their Saviour. They were Jewish Christians, or Christian Jews. Such was their position.

Still our picture has its dark side; Jewish bigotry has its place in this History. With great flippancy men are accustomed to speak of the Jews of our Saviour's day as bigots—that is, as men governed by a violent unreasoning attachment to their traditions, and ready to persecute to the death, when and where they had the power, any and all persons who might question the truth of them. And with this thought the luckless Jew is dismissed. But do we consider sufficiently the full effect of this bigotry upon the character of the Jew? We do not hesitate to affirm that it blinded his perceptions of right and wrong. He judged men, not in righteousness, but in their relation simply to his own notions and traditions. He would wink at violations of Divine Law, provided the offender paid tithes of mint, anise and cummin. The Lord pronounced His severest denunciations against the very party most noted for the strictness with which it adhered to all the niceties of ceremonial purity. He accused them of compassing sea and land to make one proselyte, and declared that when they succeeded, they made him tenfold more the child of hell than themselves. When through their machinations the person of the Redeemer was secured and brought before the governor, they themselves would not enter within the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, and so, disqualified to keep the feast; they therefore stood without, shouting Crucify Him! Crucify Him! These Jews would commit adultery themselves, though they were ready to stone man or woman caught in the act; they would steal, though they taught others not to steal; they would abhor idolatry, though they would not scruple to take and appropriate the votive offerings in the temples of idols. The name of God, says the inspired penman with hot indignation, was blasphemed among the Gentiles through them. Thus they were

thoroughly wicked and unscrupulous in life, all the while pluming themselves upon their holiness, and counting presumptuously upon the favor of Heaven, because they were of the seed of Abraham. Josephus himself, whose moral qualities, if we may credit De Quincey, were of the most questionable character, avows his belief that the Earth would have opened her mouth and swallowed up Jerusalem, had not the wrath of God in the shape of a Roman army swept it away. Such is the bigot always, dead in heart and conscience, without humanity, ready to employ deceit and every vile instrument within his reach to accomplish his ends, preferring work in the dark to sunshine, stripped of kindness, blind to the merits of his opponents whom he makes if possible his victims. The bigot rests his hopes of salvation always upon particulars which have nothing to do with his moral life, which do not interfere with his selfishness or lust, come in what form soever it may. His hatred of free, manly thought is equaled only by his hatred of the thinker. A Philip of Spain, in his zeal for the glory of God, does not scruple to plan with "diabolical sagacity"* the desolation of the Netherlands,—to blot from the book of the living, an entire people, rather than suffer it to be prosperous in what *he* dared name its heresy—he the while, wicked and base as the basest of his minions, in his own life. The venom of bigotry often slumbers, because its subjects are often insignificant, but when aroused it is fierce, hateful, and false to the core. God pity us when we find it necessary to apologize for it on the score of its sincerity.

Now Judaism was fallen into almost universal moral death and bigotry. With a sort of insane fierceness it adhered amid its utter demoralization and estrangement from God, to the letter of the Law. Ruin and the abyss were before it, men were wild with conflicting ideas, and some were taking the kingdom of Heaven by violence. The moral atmosphere in which the Jew, who was called now to choose or reject Christ Jesus, was born and nurtured, was bad in itself and unfavorable in many respects even in the event of his transition to the Church. Not all were Apostles; not all who accepted Jesus as the Messiah were partakers of His Spirit. As the little band which followed the Lord Jesus in His earthly course had its Judas, so the Church had not only its false brethren, but others likewise whose views of the work of Christ were limited entirely to the seed of Abraham "according to the flesh." They could not slough their Jewish skin nor rise above the level of their Jewish prejudices. They were the men who

* Motley.

clamored against the conduct of St. Peter in the matter of Cornelius. We fancy that the thought of preaching Jesus as an object of Faith to the uncircumcised was something that did not occur to them, or if it did, it was sure to meet with their unqualified hostility. They looked for the spread of the Gospel only through the Law. This was their first thought, devotion to it their deepest spring of action. While matters hung in suspense, or before the agitation of the relation of the Law to the Gospel, they were not noticeable for any dangerous traits of character—but when the crisis came they displayed the fierce bigotry of their nation, and their Christianity was submerged beneath their Judaism.

It is necessary now to notice how and by whom the crisis came. In the moment of CHRIST'S first appearance to Saul, on his way to Damascus, He revealed to him his field of ministerial labor. It was his special work to carry the Gospel of salvation to the Gentiles. In the execution of his mission he went from city to city preaching Christ as the Son of God, through whom men were justified by faith without the works of the Law. This was the universal truth and gospel for the nations who were without God in the world, and were strangers to the Covenants of Promise. It was Paul's work to lift the Gospel "clear over" all the barriers of Judaism, and to preach the faith of Christ to all men, irrespective of blood, kindredship, or tongue. Here was a grand Catholic principle, that by the Cross of CHRIST *God* was creating from the two divisions of the world—Jewish and Gentile—one new spiritual body. In fact, St. Paul himself personally seems to have felt this as a great mystery, i. e. Revelation. The Epistle to the Ephesians, written late in his life, fully shows how deeply he was impressed not only with the grandeur, but with the *newness* of this truth. He declares it to have been the mystery hidden from the past ages of the world, but now made known through the Apostles. It was a truth quite at war with the world's thought—so much at war with the ordinary ideas of mankind, as not to have been *evolved* from his own mind in the way of logical deduction or ratiocination from admitted principles. On the contrary, it was a Revelation—it was beyond and above the reach of human thought as such. And this truth seized his innermost being. Christ appeared to him as the central bond and power to hold mankind together, and faith in Him whereby we are justified was the Catholic Gospel which he was sent to proclaim to the uncircumcised world, come what might in the shape of opposition from any or from all who were still in bondage to Jewish prejudice. Now it must be obvious that this great idea, this

new mystery or Revelation, which he announced as a mystery, this new doctrine that man is justified without the works of the Law, would sooner or later bring the Apostle of the Gentiles directly to the question of the relation of the Law to the Gospel. For Gentile Churches were multiplying alike in number and power, and what were they to do in the matter of the Law? In what light did it become them to regard it? Were its provisions in whole or in part, binding upon them or not? This was the inevitable question grounded in and caused by the very gospel which Paul preached and which they received. And to this question we have a full and satisfactory answer in the Apostle's own writings. What he had preached, that he also wrote. His doctrine was one and the same everywhere, whether by word of mouth or by written composition. We plant ourselves in this matter, especially upon the Epistle to the Galatians, written, perhaps, during the stormiest and most trying period of his life. The object of this Epistle is not to set forth the doctrine of justification by faith. The spirit of this doctrine, indeed, everywhere pervades it, but next to the vindication of his own apostleship, St. Paul devotes himself fully to the development of this theme—the relation of the Law to the Gospel. To this end, he goes back to a period antecedent to the promulgation of the law, to the days of the patriarch Abraham. Abraham believed God, and this was counted to him for righteousness. The possession of Abraham's faith entitles a man, and this alone, to the claim of sonship to Abraham. Because God would justify the Heathen by faith, He communicated the glad tidings before hand—"in thee shall all the nations be blessed." This was the promise, "in thy seed," which is, adds St. Paul, Christ. This was the glorious Covenant which the Law given 430 years afterwards could not annul. Christ then was the fulfillment of the promise. He became a curse in order that the blessing enjoyed by Abraham might be extended to the Gentiles, not through circumcision, but through that faith by which Abraham himself was justified "while in uncircumcision."

Hence the question, What of the Law? Is it the overthrow, the annulment of the promise of God made before its promulgation? God forbid. Now while allowing it to be of divine origin, the Apostle nevertheless sets it forth as a temporary, provisional institution. It was added because of transgressions "*until the seed should come to whom* the promise was made." It was simply our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. Christ however having come, the functions of the schoolmaster cease; the Law as such and its necessity alike disappear. The princi-

ple is illustrated by the example of an heir during his minority He differs in nothing from a servant, notwithstanding his suzerainty, but is placed under governors and tutors until the time appointed by his father is completed. "So we," adds the Apostle, "when we were children were held in bondage," under the elements of the world, i. e., we were instructed in the rudiments and elementary principles of religion. "But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law that He might redeem them that are under the law, that we might receive the adoption"—and so enjoy the inheritance. The Law then having served its purpose was henceforth dead by the fiat of God. Its claims had ceased. The Gentiles had nothing to do with it. To submit to circumcision on the ground of its necessity to salvation was to fall from grace. The Apostle however does even more than state in this style the relation of the Law to the Gospel. He penetrates into the inner characteristics and properties of law. "If indeed a law had been given which was able to make alive, then verily righteousness (i. e., justification) would have been by law." This was a work however beyond its reach. Elsewhere he shows how true this is. The Law was the strength of sin; it brought to light man's knowledge of sin, but it could not confer righteousness, nor secure for the soul its lasting peace. It could not turn the current of a sinful temper. In fact, it increased sin, though in itself holy, just, and good. By it sin took occasion and deceived men and put them to a moral death. Under law the world could but feel its sorrow and its guilt. Eternal life was closed against hope; the pressure of the consciousness of the body of death was terrific. God was not near—the Heavens were as brass. The seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is a description of man under the Law—is St. Paul's statement of its inability to effect pardon and new life, is an argument to justify his declaration of the death of the believer unto it by the "body of Christ," and serves as an introduction to the thought of man's glorious freedom and sonship in Christ.

It must be remembered, however, that the Apostle did not begin his ministry among the Gentiles by negations concerning the law of Moses. This was not "the mystery," not "the Gospel," he was sent to preach. He moved in the sphere of divine revelation and of positive truth proclaiming Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. From the revealed truth to his inferences concerning the relation of the law to his Gentile converts the transition was natural enough, but it was fully developed and clearly stated only where the exigencies of his and their situa-

tion required it. Antioch, Philippi, Corinth, Ephesus, Galatia, and other places were visited, and the Gospel was preached to them under its positive forms. Churches and communities were formed. Jesus Christ became enthroned in Gentile hearts, and they were at once the brethren, aye, the spiritual children of the Apostle, without circumcision. The demonstration of the spirit, powers and gifts accompanied the heroic preacher. He labored with all the might of his kingly spirit, "a spirit which trembled before the violence of no storm," to set forth Jesus Christ crucified among them; he labored in travail that He might be formed in them the hope of glory. He beheld the process of the long hidden mystery; he saw the one new man—the spiritual body growing and strengthening, whereof Christ was the life and the uniting principle. Among these Gentile Churches, however, were believing Jews. They perhaps could not feel the force of the Apostle's teachings in full, nor reconcile themselves to religious association with the uncircumcised. Reports of "Paul's Gospel" through these, we fancy more particularly, reached the mother Church at Jerusalem and dissatisfaction soon took the form of definite opposition, while suspicion was transformed into relentless and unscrupulous hate. For, a counter movement was forthwith set on foot, but its first steps we cannot trace. They are lost in the obscurity of unrecorded fact. The names of the men who undertook it have perished from the memory of the world. Suffice it to say, they stood in direct antagonism over against the Apostle Paul, and resolved to preach another Gospel to save the Law and the traditions from contumely and destruction. It was simply a movement in behalf of the Law to which, according to St. Paul, believers *had died.* Its significance for Christian History is that it was an expiring struggle of the law on the soil of the new faith and within the pale of the Church itself. It could not yield its hopes of permanent and universal authority without a conflict. It could not passively behold the ruin of its own supremacy. It must fight for its life; must, if necessary, vilify, persecute and trample in the dust the man who dared desert and pronounce it dead. The old venom of Jewish bigotry breaks forth in the Church. The measures invariably adopted by fanatics and bigots when their shibboleths are in danger, must be employed. It was at Antioch that they began their attack. Antioch was a magnificent city. Under its warm Syrian sky, it could furnish for its own citizens as well as strangers, attractions that eclipsed Imperial Rome itself. As usual with Greek cities, the splendor of the worship of its deities was commingled with most seductive and elaborate arts in

the way of pleasure. Its abandonment to idolatry was a sort of synonym with excessive devotion to amusement. They kept "high holiday" there. The brilliant sun, the cool marbles, the Fora, baths, porticoes, and temples, all sumptuous, were associated with notions of enjoyment. Sacred groves consecrated to divinities, were but shaded retreats for the revels and mirth of the people. The excess to which they were carried may be inferred from the fact that soldiers were forbidden to enter within their precincts. In those days the one strong thing was the Roman army. Even here the Gospel had been preached by brethren who had fled from Jerusalem "upon the persecution that arose about Stephen." These confined their labors to the Jews only. (Acts 11: 19.) Men of Cyprus and Cyrene, however, came to Antioch, and began to preach the Lord Jesus unto the "Grecians."* A great number of them believed and turned unto the Lord. Soon the need of teachers was felt. Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem—(no turmoil as yet)—to carry on the work. He seeing its magnitude and knowing his man, went to seek Saul. The Apostle returned with him, and henceforth this city, owing, we fancy, chiefly to its situation, became for him a center of operations, and the starting point for his missionary journeys. Hither then in due time the zealots for the Law came. They came to put an end to Paul and to his Gospel. They had a message as well as he. "Certain men came from Judea and taught this word, except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." This was their gospel. Christ was a secondary Person in their thought. With this formula they attacked St. Paul as also the citadel of Gentile Christendom. Men were forced to choose sides. The conflict becomes sharp forthwith. St. Peter is there, so is St. Paul, with Barnabas. Peter had been "eating with the Gentiles." Whether by this eating we understand association with them in a free way, in genuine brotherly intercourse, grounded upon the spiritual equality of the members of Christ, or whether we limit it to communion with them in the breaking of bread, the principle is one and the same for us. He yields before the clamor of these Jerusalem partisans. He dares not encounter their fierce rage. He secretly withdraws from his Gentile brethren, and Barnabas himself, the steadfast friend of Paul hitherto, is carried away by his dissimulation. This is a comment upon their activity and influence. Paul is

* "Grecians," i. e. Gentile Greeks, as distinguished from Hellenists. The Text. recep. reads Ἕλληνας; but all the modern critical Editors read Ἕλληνες, on the authority of the best MSS.

eserted; but he is faithful to his Lord and to himself. He onfronts Peter, and withstands him to his face; accuses him of *ypocrisy*, (υποκρισις)—i. e., of action contrary to his own convic-ions. The entire Church is swayed to and fro by questioning nd dispute. It is discovered that a great principle is involved —is Christianity simply Judaism? or is it the fulfillment of the romise made to Abraham? Is it the Law? or is it the mystery ow made known for the first time? Like all contests involving leas, this too came to the minds of most men concerned in it, nder a concrete form. The question was narrowed down to he obligations of the Gentiles to receive circumcision. If the entiles submit to this rite, that is, if they become Jewish roselytes, then Christianity as a universal religion, then the ospel as St. Paul preaches it, must perish. It is ever thus in istory. Philosophers and thinkers discuss principles in their bstract form; but the people, in their application to laws, ights, customs, ordinances or privileges. Henry VIII finds apal supremacy a burden and an intrusion—he breaks with ne Pope: Luther aims his blows at the iniquity of the "Indul-ences-sales,"—Empires forthwith are torn by controversy: lood flows in torrents, new forms of religious life appear, a ew era in the history of mankind is begun. So here in An-ioch the life of Christianity as a universal religion hangs upon he issue of the stormy debate—"are Gentile Christians under bligation to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses?"

Here, then, we have the formula of the Judaizers—ye must e circumcised. How they pressed their notions, how espe-ially they attacked and harried St. Paul, is well sketched by r. Stanley.* 'Every point in his authority which seemed pen to question, every trait of his character which could by hy possibility admit of a sinister interpretation would be at nce turned against him, even though it may seem to us the est proof of his Divine Mission and of his saintly character. 'He had not seen the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 9:1) in his lifetime" —such we know from his own epistle, was the language used oncerning him, strange as it now seems to recall it—"his au-hority was only by man and through man," it might be from he prophets of Antioch, it might be from those "at Jerusalem ho were Apostles before him, (Gal. 1:1, 17.) He was only a ew of Tarsus, not of pure Palestine origin like the original welve, (2 Cor. 11:22; Phil. 3:5,) with no letters of com-endation from the mother Church at Jerusalem, (2 Cor. 3:1,

* Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age—a work which has not received, least in this country, the attention it merits, though it should be read with aution.

10 : 18, 12.) His very appearance and conduct betrayed the hollowness of his claims. "His letters," indeed, from a distance were "weighty and powerful," but his "bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible," (2 Cor. 10 : 10.) His "infirmities in the flesh" were manifest to all, (2 Cor. 11 : 30; 12 : 10; Gal. 4 : 13.) Even he himself had confessed that he had "no excellency of speech or of wisdom," (1 Cor. 2 : 1, 3.) Even the Heathens round about, whilst in Barnabas they had recognized the majesty of Jupiter, in the insignificance of Paul had observed only the chief speaking of Mercurius, (Acts 14 : 12.) He was conscious himself of his inability to carry out his authority; he fixed and unfixed the times of his coming; he used "lightness," and the things that he purposed, he purposed according to the flesh, so that his vacillating intentions were alternately "yea, yea," and "nay, nay," (2 Cor. 1 : 17,) "in absence only, he was bold towards them, in presence he was base," (2 Cor. 10 : 1.) He made a great boast of receiving no maintenance from the Greek Churches, but the real reason was that he did not venture to exercise that true apostolical privilege. He worked with his own hands, only because he "had not power to eat and drink" (1 Cor. 9 : 4, 6; 2 Cor. 11 : 10) at the cost of the Church. He remained single only because "he had not power to lead about a sister as a wife," like the other undoubted apostles, the great saints of the Jewish Church, "the brethren of the Lord and Cephas," (1 Cor. 9 : 5.) And yet all this seeming simplicity was merely a cover for serving his own interests. Every one knew how easily he could "become all things to all men," (1 Cor. 9 : 22.) Was there no fear lest "his exhortations should not be of deceit and uncleanness and guile;" "flattering words and a cloak for covetousness, (1 Thes. 2 : 3, 5,) in fleshly wisdom; "dealing in the hidden things of dishonesty;" "walking craftily and handling the Word of God deceitfully," (2 Cor. 1 : 12; 2 : 17; 4 : 2,) "with secret meaning," (2 Cor. 3 : 12,) "writing other things than would be read or acknowledged" on the surface? (2 Cor. 1 : 13.) In this very matter of the refusal of maintenance, "be it so, he in his own person (*εγω*) did not burden them, but being crafty he caught them with guile;" whilst pretending to receive nothing from them himself, and on this ground, he yet contrived to "make a gain of them by Titus, and those whom he had sent" (2 Cor. 12 : 18) to collect the contribution which was to be ministered through him to the poor Christians in Judea,' (2 Cor. 8 : 20, 21.) In such style was the Apostle attacked and opposed. The Judaizers were ready to move Heaven and earth to strip him of his well gained influence, to destroy the prestige of his name and power

l all the Churches of Christ. They sought to destroy his gos-
el by destroying him. By hoping to make him appear con-
mptible, they trusted that they could undo the effect of his
achings, and bring in their own traditions, and secure the
iumph of the Law. How well they understood their work:
nly they forgot that the great God had and kept the disposal
f events in His own hands. Over against their scandalous de-
mations and detractions, by which they sought to exhibit St.
'aul in the light both of an apostate and intruder, they set
rth their own claims to be considered as true exponents of the
ith of Christ. The scene of the conflict is soon transferred
om Antioch to Corinth, Ephesus, (Acts 20: 29,) Galatia. The
road theatre of St. Paul's activity soon resounded with the
lamor of faction, was agitated by grave doubt calling forth
ie fears of the Apostle, while they quickened his labors. Often
nd often in weariness of spirit he went on his way, fearing, it
ould seem, lest his adversaries, powerful and numerous, should
inder the course of the Gospel and destroy the souls for whom
hrist had died. He was troubled on every side, yet not distress-
d, perplexed but not in despair, persecuted but not forsaken,
stdown but not destroyed. By his personal presence, by entreaty
nd argument, by letter, in every way like a great Leader, girding
imself for battle with a wily and dangerous foe, he is a presence
nd power to keep together the Churches in the truth he had so
obly maintained. They tracked him "as vultures their prey."
Vhithersoever he went, they went. Wheresoever he preached,
ney preached. Whomsoever he told ye are dead to the Law,
ney told, unless you keep the Law, ye cannot be saved.

Here, then, is a controversy which affected in greater or less
egree the entire Church. On the one side are the Judaizers,
etermined at all hazards to preserve the Law, to enforce their
raditions, to convert the Gospel into a perfected Judaism,
ctive, unscrupulous, possessed of influence that was felt even
n the remote province of Galatia. On the other side is St.
'aul, almost alone, working with a preternatural energy for the
ery truth which could secure for the Gospel triumph beyond
he limits of Judaism, filled with a noble enthusiasm for his
ause, sustained and inspired by the Holy Spirit of God. But
his was not the only form of error he was called to combat.
here are, in his later Epistles, intimations, and reproofs, and
arnings, against a coming evil. The cloud was gathering
hich hung balefully over the Church of the next century. It
ad not acquired size and power during his own life time. We
efer to Gnosticism and its attendant evils. The dissensions
aused by the Gnostics belong, therefore, a little later in histo-

ry; and St. Paul's relation to them, in the way of denunciation, is prophetic, rather than actual. We speak, however, with some hesitation founded upon the obscurity of the beginnings of Gnosticism within the Church. Its rise is to be traced to Alexandria; its forms were Jewish on the one hand, and anti-Jewish on the other. The great party movement, in the full noon of the Apostolic Age, is simply this Jewish one, having for its objects the entire submission of the Gentile world to circumcision and the Law, or else rejection from the Covenant of Grace. The great difference, therefore, between the Judaizing movement in the Apostolic Age and Gnosticism, is, that the former was materializing, and, at the same time, a tangible, concrete thing, full of party vigor, while the other was dim and shadowy, a form of thought rather than a party organization, the time for this not having yet arrived.

St. Paul now disappears. A noble Basilica, one of the wonders of modern Rome, preserves the tradition of the locality where he is said to have been beheaded. To us is there deep meaning in the fact that it is named, San Paolo fuore le more, (St. Paul beyond the walls,) for the spirit of the Apostle is sedulously kept outside the walls of Rome, and "green eyed basilisks" guard the portals of a people's heart. It may well stand apart—a monument; for it is not the symbol of a power living there. But matters were different eighteen hundred years ago. Rome then did not reject Paul. His principle did not perish with him. Still the curtain falls while the action of the drama is in suspense. Darkness, which prevents all perception of the immediate succession of events, overtakes us. We scarcely can tell the effect his Epistles produced upon the Corinthians and Galatians. We know not the effect occasioned by his martyrdom. True, the clamor of party warfare is not heard. Yet we may fairly infer that the Judaizers found great relief when they no longer had to fear his personal presence in thwarting their measures. We cannot suppose, however, that their action ceased forthwith. The head and front of the Apostasy removed, was not victory before them? This, however, is mere conjecture, for the party had no representative or spokesman whose words have been preserved. We only know that the party did not die forthwith. When the development of Church life is hidden, it need not surprise us that this, too, is hidden. The next we see and hear of the Judaizers, after the stormy battles in which Apostles were the heroes, and of which they were the leaders, is in the second century, when they present many of their well known features, though, of course, they appear under such modifications as their outward history and

their inward life and habits would naturally suggest to a reflective mind. They are the same in substance, nearly the same in form. They appear as before, under the form of strict adherents to the Mosaic Law on the one hand, rough, materialistic, hateful, pitiful, and, on the other, under the influence of idealizing tendencies, as Gnostics. For, as we have already noted, Gnosticism has its Jewish as well as its anti-Jewish side—its Basilides as well as its Marcion. There is now, moreover, a singular absence of all great personages; no Peter, no John, to uphold the cause of righteousness and freedom; no able opponent to endanger its onward course. Individual agencies and powers for a little while are almost lost sight of. It is hard to make anything more than a name, even of Clement of Rome, a man beyond all doubt of large and salutary influence in his day. But two things had happened which, at this stage, had rendered the aspirations of the ultra Judaizers thoroughly hopeless.

In the first place, Jerusalem had fallen, before the arms of Titus. In the clash of battle, amid fire and slaughter, the Temple fell, and with it fell the "center of unity," for Judaism as such. As long as it remained, served by the ancient priesthood and filled with worshiping children of Abraham, the Judaizing party had a rallying cry of no mean import and power. They could go up and down the Empire, declaring that *facts* contradicted Paul. The law was dead. Believers had died to it, he said, but was not this false in every sense, since its institutions and priesthood still existed, its Temple worship, ordained by God Himself, was suffering no interruption? What, under such circumstances, could Paul's doctrine be worth? Was it not refuted by the irrefragable argument of fact? And could any man hope for salvation if he turned his back upon this divine Covenant? Such questioning, supported by the fact to which the Judaizers appealed, had its weight with many minds. They pointed to Jerusalem with pride, for it was the ark, the citadel of their strength. The arguments which Gibbon, in his famous fifteenth chapter, has put into their mouths, belong, it seems to us, to a later period in the history of the controversy. They are too abstract. "They affirmed," he remarks, "that if the Being, who is the same through all eternity, had designed to abolish those sacred rights which had served to distinguish His chosen people, the repeal of them would have been no less clear and solemn than their first promulgation; that instead of those frequent declarations which either suppose or assert the perpetuity of the Mosaic religion, it would have been represented as a provisionary scheme, intended to last only till the coming of the Messiah, who should in-

struct mankind in a more perfect mode of faith and of worship; that the Messiah Himself and His disciples, who conversed with Him on earth, instead of authorizing by their example the most minute observances of the Mosaic law, would have published to the world the abolition of those useless and obsolete ceremonies, without suffering Christianity to remain during so many years obscurely confounded among the sects of the Jewish Church." Such objections were but as pale moonshine compared with the patent fact of the continued existence of the Temple service. This being engulfed in the abyss, then came the thin logic of men, conscious that their strength was gone. The fall of Jerusalem was the judgment of God upon the merits of the controversy, between them and St. Paul; it was a clear demonstration that the Law was at an end; it was a confirmation of the Apostle's gospel; it was a blow from which the Judaizers never recovered. A gulf of fire henceforth separated Judaism from Christianity.

In the second place, Christianity was spreading with the rapidity and vigor of its own supernatural divine life, among the Gentiles. Every great city of the world had its Church numbering thousands of members, and the Gospel was penetrating into the farthest west, to Gaul, Spain, and even to Britain. Its course was wonderful. Its success was a stupendous miracle. Its power, its spirit, its life, were beyond the reach of imperial persecution, or of popular hate. Its Jewish complexion was almost gone. It had become a great Gentile movement and power. For the Greeks it was Greek; for the Spaniard it was equally indigenous. It was seizing the living world in its multiform and manifold peculiarities; was found to be above all the lines of race or of region. The divorce between Jew and Christian was complete; the Gentiles had become the standard bearers, the soldiers of the Cross. The Gospel which they received, and for which they toiled and suffered, was the Gospel as Paul had preached it. Clement, of Rome, writing to the Corinthians, speaks of the Apostle as the most illustrious example of patience. And, by the *middle* of the second century, the question was mooted whether it was lawful for a Christian to keep the law of Moses.

Here, then, were two causes, each of which alone was sufficient to give to the Judaizing party its quietus. Traces of its spirit, indeed, can be found in the second century, especially in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. But it could no longer make any headway. "The times" were against it; God was against it. We have thought it a phenomenon not unworthy of fresh notice, because especially the adjustment of

the controversy connected with it, conveys a lesson for this, and, we may add, for all generations of believers. When we speak of its adjustment, we do not refer to any conciliar action in the premises, but to its end and to the mode of its end.

Irenæus, in writing against heretics and heresies, mentions the Ebionites as a Jewish-Christian sect living apart from the com munion of the Catholic Church. They clung to the belief that the observance of the Law was still binding upon men, although they continued to accept Jesus as the Messiah. No one can doubt that these were the successors of the Judaizers of the Apostolic age, the enemies of St. Paul, of the party that wished to identify Law and Gospel. They lingered along for centuries a miserable death-in-life not fed by the juices of the living Church, not blessed by God, not able to do anything or to say any word for the good of men. The Church in Abyssinia, we believe, still continues to practice the rite of Circumcision, and thus the Ebionites, after a fashion, may be said to have perpetuated themselves on the confines of Christian civilization. The Church did not cut them off in technical form, but true to their master idea of the "concision" they cut themselves off. By insisting upon something as necessary to salvation, as part of the new economy which did not belong to it, they lost the Church's sense of the Being of Christ and His work, they misunderstood the entire drift of the Gospel; they rejected St. Paul's view of it and used only a gospel according to the Hebrews. They disappear from the life of Christianity, and Pella is at once a by-word and a wonder alike to Jew and to Christian. The more moderate of them remained within the Church, and their Jewish feelings were soon lost in the stream of Gentile faith. And so the controversy ceased. It ceased because the men who had fomented it, had no longer a thought which belonged to the real fortunes of the Christian Church. The Church no longer cared for what the Judaizers said; its sphere of activity and the level of its thought were different from theirs. The two parted company—the one with a great future before it growing and spreading, the other poor and imbecile, clinging to a past the significance of which it did not comprehend. But the Church in her thoughts and institutions bore no marks of a mere ultraism over against the Judaizers. There was a party, indeed, that repudiated everything Jewish, but it too fell away from the communion of the great body of believers. The Church accepted St. Paul's teachings respecting the Law. It preserved the Jewish Canon of Scripture; it held and recognized the historic continuity and development of Revelation until it reached its culminating point in the Lord Jesus Christ. How absurd to

regard the Catholic stand-point of the second century as a sort of compromise between *Petrine* and *Pauline* Christianity; absurd in the highest degree when we bear in mind that St. Paul's own words, written in the heat of the controversy, were reverently held from first to last as the truth respecting the relation of the Law to the Gospel. And yet Dr. Baur and his friends assure us that a compromise alone explains the posture of the Church. No wonder that Bunsen speaks of "the Tübingen Romance."

We have seen that the Judaizers finding their aspirations and notions of no avail within the Church separated from it. The controversy died because none were left to do duty in behalf of the Judaizing interest. This is but the symbol of the end of all parties identical in spirit with their own. All along the course of history men are found maintaining with the greatest pertinacity the force and authority of certain institutions or notions which may indeed have been good and valuable in their day, but are so no longer. When this happens, then if they adhere to their position they soon view all interests, human and divine, from the narrow stand-point of their own thought. It soon becomes their all; and they are all the more violent and bitter just in proportion as they behold the living world moving on in its mighty march and leaving them behind. From the days of the Judaizers all along the course of history, one movement has followed another, party interests have divided Churches and communities; fierce invective has been heard in the house of God; fierce hatred been exhibited in the family of Jesus Christ; things have hung in equipoise, but the false has dropped off, and the Church in the possession of the unchanging truth of the Gospel has moved on. She weds at times indeed other things than true; appears covered over with the growth of centuries, but the wind and storm of thought carry these away, and that which remains is that which was "in the beginning." Forms of thought undergo modifications and changes. It were folly then to spend our strength upon anything which does not belong to the proper life of the Christian Church. Our party interests, our narrow notions perish. This is the law of the Church's existence. That alone, in the ordering of Almighty God, remains which is essential to her life, her progress, and her final completion.

Art. II.—THE REV. JAMES MURDOCK, D. D.

Perhaps we need offer no apology for inserting the following Article. It is prompted not only by our own sense of what is due to the memory of Dr. Murdock, but also by the fact of his personal and valued acquaintance with many of the leading divines and scholars of the Church, and still more by the remembrance of his efficient labors in the cause of sound learning and Ecclesiastical History, by which he will long be known and honored by many to whom he was personally a stranger. Besides, the life of so distinguished a scholar, and so excellent a man, may not be without its value, especially to the young men of the present day. The history of the Murdock family, and most of the leading facts in his own life, we take from the "Memoirs of the Class of 1797," published in 1848.

James Murdock was born, Feb. 16th, 1776, at Westbrook, Middlesex County, Ct., of Protestant Scotch-Irish descent. His great great grandfather, John Murdock, was a wool-comber in Limeric, in Ireland, during the reigns of Charles II, and James II. He married Mary Munson, had one son and three daughters, lost all his property in the siege of Limeric in 1691, and died about the year 1695. His only son, Peter Murdock, born at Limeric in 1679, came to America about the year 1700, married Mary Fithin of East Hampton, on Long Island, where he spent most of his life. He accumulated a handsome property, and died at Westbrook in 1753, aged 74. His only child, John Murdock, was born at East Hampton in 1706, removed early to Westbrook, became a large farmer, was Major of the Provincial troops, Deacon in the Congregational Church, and Judge in the Court of Common Pleas. He died at Westbrook in 1778, aged 72. His first wife was Phebe Sill of Lyme, who died ten months after marriage. His second wife was Frances Conklin of East Hampton. She bore him thirteen children, seven sons and six daughters, all of whom lived to maturity. She died in 1799, aged 86. Three of the sons of John Murdock, graduated at Yale College; viz, Peter, graduated in 1755, and died the same year; Jonathan, graduated in 1766, became a Congregational minister, and died at Bozrah in 1813, aged 68; James, graduated in 1774, settled over the Congregational Church in Sandgate, Vt., removed to Martinsburg, N. Y., and died at Crown Point in 1840, aged 84. The other

sons were all farmers. ABRAHAM, the eleventh child and sixth son, died at Westbrook in 1777, aged 26, leaving two young children; Anna, who married J. J. Avery of Groton, bore him twelve children, and died in 1817, aged 44; and JAMES, the subject of this memoir. The wife of Abraham Murdock and mother of James, was Hannah Lay of Westbrook, a daughter of Jonathan Lay, senior, and sister of Judge Jonathan Lay of Westbrook. She married, for her second husband, Seth Smith, Esq., of East Lyme, bore him two sons, and died in 1824, aged 70.

JAMES MURDOCK, an orphan at the age of fourteen months, passed his childhood partly in East Lyme, and partly in Westbrook, with no peculiar advantages for education till the age of fifteen, when he commenced fitting for College with his uncle, Rev. Jonathan Murdock of Bozrah. He entered College, poorly fitted, in October, 1793, at the age of seventeen years, joined the College Church in October, 1794, and graduated in 1797,—taking the second appointment in a Class distinguished for talents and attainments. He bore away also the Berkeleian Premium, given to the best scholar in the Class, and to the one who passes the best examination in Latin and Greek. Thus, notwithstanding the defects of his early education, and his youth, he already gave indications of his future eminence as a scholar.

"His class," says one, "was the first which came fairly under the formative influence of President Dwight, the class of 1797—a class in many respects remarkable. Its first class-meeting, after graduation, was at the close of half a century. At that time twenty-four out of thirty-seven were still living, and twelve of them were present to rehearse to each other the experiences of fifty years. The successive College tutors of that class were James Gould, Roger Minot Sherman, and Josiah Meigs. The effect of their training, under those men and the illustrious President, appears in the stations they have held and in the work they have done for their country and for the world. Such names as Henry Baldwin, (a Judge of the Supreme Court of the U. S.,) Lyman Beecher, Diodate Brockway, (long a Fellow of Yale College,) Thomas Day, (Secretary of Connecticut, and long editor of Day's Reports,) Samuel A. Foot, (Governor of Connecticut, and U. S. Senator,) George Griffin and Seth P. Staples, (so eminent in the legal profession,) and Horatio Seymour, (U. S. Senator from Vermont,)—show what the class was. Every one of the thirty-seven was a native of New England."

In the November following, he became Preceptor of the

Hopkins Grammar School in New Haven. Relinquishing that office in March, 1799, he commenced the study of theology under President Dwight. In the following autumn, in conjunction with his Classmate, Rev. John Niles, he took charge, for one year, of Hamilton Oneida Academy, now Hamilton College, at Clinton, N. Y. In September, 1800, he resumed the study of theology under the Rev. A. S. Norton, D. D., of Clinton, was licensed in January, 1801, by the Oneida Association, supplied New Hartford till April, and then returned to New Haven. During the summer of 1801, he preached sometime at Oxford, Conn., as a supply, and spent four weeks in the family of Rev. Azel Backus, D. D., of Bethlehem, both supplying his pulpit and instructing in his private academy. In the fall of that year, he was invited to preach as a candidate at Princeton, Worcester County, Mass. In February, 1802, he received a unanimous call to settle there, and was ordained the June following. For some years his ministry seemed to produce little fruit, but in 1810 it was attended by a revival, in which about fifty persons, most of them heads of families, were added to the church. While at Princeton, Mr. Murdock was a close student, and made considerable advances, particularly in sacred literature. In 1815, being appointed Professor of the learned languages in the University of Vermont, he resigned his pastoral charge and removed to Burlington, where he officiated, not only as Professor of the learned languages, but also as Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. In 1818, he was elected Professor of Languages in Dartmouth College, an office which he declined. In the spring of 1819, being appointed Brown Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History in the Theological Seminary at Andover, he left Vermont and returned to Massachusetts. In the autumn of that year, Harvard University conferred on him the honorary degree of S. T. D. Difficulties soon afterwards arose between him and the other Professors, respecting his course of duties in the Seminary, which continued several years, and at last issued, in 1828, in his dismission from the Institution. He removed to New Haven in 1829, where he continued to reside, retired very much from public life, and devoted to private studies and especially to Ecclesiastical History. For a few years he preached and delivered lectures in different places, but of late seldom appeared as a public speaker. He was made an honorary member of the New York Historical Society several years ago; also Vice President, and recently President, of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was

Philological Society of Connec-
the original founders. He was
honorary members of the Amer-
contributor to its learned
Oriental Scholars, so select
in America, but three in
Europe, and a few in Asia.
Murdock went to Columbus,
winter in the family of his
the Southern country, and
the ensuing Spring;
powers gave way, and
affection could prompt
yet that life continued
about 4 o'clock, A. M.
its earthly tenement for a

an immense concourse, and
by every class of people.
a few months, had won a
Sturdy men, unused to
and the tide of warm-
rich and poor, bond and
the grief of far-distant mourn-
a sacred duty and privilege
remembered by them with

were emphatically those of a
in society in the society of his
Few, we think, have
passed a happier old age.
of the Connecticut
regularity; and yet no
titles as the evening
that that of the "Club."
Christian scholars of
described as "a noble fra-
was an honored member—a
and students, whom
from active studies;
with lamps of piety

whom he had known
his heart went out in
tributes to his memory.

his friends cherish none with more grateful emotions than the Resolutions, &c., which we give in a foot-note below.*

We have thus sketched briefly the leading events in the life of Dr. Murdock; and we now proceed to advert to some of the

---

* The Late Rev. Dr. Murdock.—The Club, composed of retired Ministers of the Gospel, and gentlemen of other professions, which meets each week at the house of the Rev. Jeremiah Day, D. D., having at their session on Thursday morning, the 21st inst., received intelligence of the death of the Rev. James Murdock, D. D., a member of this body, who was absent from them on a visit to his son at Columbus, Miss., deemed it proper, as a mark of respect and affection towards their deceased brother, and as a testimony of their sympathy with the bereaved family, to unite in some open expression of their sentiments on the occasion.

For this purpose the following preamble and resolves, prepared by a Committee, were presented to their body at the next regular session and received their unanimous approval and adoption:

Whereas, it has pleased God in His wise and holy Providence, to remove by death the Rev. James Murdock, D. D., from the society of his kindred, from communion with this literary and religious circle, and from his public service in the Church on earth; and, whereas, our brother was highly beloved and esteemed for his ability and faithfulness in all these stations:

Resolved, That we deeply mourn the loss which is experienced from his removal from the scenes of his earthly labors, and more especially his removal from this circle which he was wont so much to enliven and enlighten with his presence. At the same time, we would bow with submission to a wise and over-ruling Providence which has numbered his days, and thankfully acknowledge the goodness of God, who qualified him with eminent gifts of knowledge, wisdom and grace, for doing good among men; and who called him to fill successfully during his whole life, even to a good old age, various spheres of usefulness, in the respective stations of a teacher of youth, a Minister of the Gospel, a Collegiate Professor, a Theological Professor, an associate and counselor of his literary friends, and an author of works prepared and published to advance the cause of Biblical Literature, Ecclesiastical History, and Theological Learning.

Resolved, That we sympathize with the children of the deceased in the sorrow they feel for the loss of a father to whom their hearts were bound by strong and tender ties; and we pray that in the midst of their affliction the Holy Spirit would inspire them with thankfulness for that example of Christian fidelity and parental love in which their father walked before them while living, and for the hope they are now permitted to indulge that he is gone to be with Christ in a higher and holier sphere of existence than any earthly; and that in their bereavement God would make their joy the more to abound in the quickening and

[illegible]

[illegible]

JEREMIAH DAY.

[illegible]

1845, and completed on the 16th of June, 1846. It was published in 1851. Not far from that time the aged scholar began the study of Arabic, pursuing it with habitual d ligence as a daily occupation."

"A sermon on 'the nature of the Atonement,' preached by Dr. M. in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary at Andover in 1823, and published by the students, became the occasion of some imputations against his orthodoxy. * * * And yet Dr. Murdock was by no means an innovator in theology, or an extremist. His habit of mind, in regard to the statement and illustration of Christian doctrines, was conservative rather than revolutionary. The breadth of his studies in the various departments of theological learning, and especially in the history of theology, had not been without its effect upon his way of thinking; he accepted no doctrine merely because it was the doctrine of the Westminster standard, or the doctrine of the New England churches; he held himself independent of all human authority; but he nevertheless held 'the doctrines of grace' in the form in which they were defined and defended by the great masters of New England theology—yet, probably, without holding, certainly without exaggerating or overvaluing the peculiarities by which any one of those masters may have differed from the others. His mind was too well balanced for any extravagance, too enlightened and too free to accept the yoke of any narrow school or party."

The nine years which Dr. Murdock spent at Andover formed the most eventful, and in some respects the most important period of his life, and as it has already been made a matter of public record, we cannot wholly pass it by. His Professorship in the Theological Seminary, which he was urged in the strongest manner to accept, promised to give him an opportunity for careful research in that department of study for which he had a keen relish and peculiar capabilities. A Professorship in Dartmouth College was at this time offered and urged upon him, while to sunder his connection with the University of Burlington would involve him in considerable pecuniary sacrifices, and interrupt his prospects of more extended usefulness in that young Institution. The Corporation of the University, on his leaving, "voted that the thanks of the Corporation be presented to Professor Murdock for his able and faithful discharge of the duties of his Office." He yielded to the most pressing importunity, and in July, 1819, became "Brown Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History," and entered upon his new duties with high anticipations of a life of usefulness and happiness. Perhaps no situation could have

been found which promised to be more congenial with his tastes, habits, and feelings. With a meager, but in some respects valuable library at his command, and with a mind thoroughly alive to the duties and responsibilities of his new position, he found himself at once surrounded by young men, many of them ranking as the first scholars in the various colleges in the country, and now ardent, ambitious, eager in their thirst for knowledge; and to these, Dr. Murdock endeared himself. His house was the home of some, and the habitual resort of many. These men saw Dr. Murdock in his strength, and appreciated him. His thoroughness as a scholar, the vigor and grasp of his mind, his keen acumen, his impartial judgment and unswerving truthfulness, his facility and pleasure in imparting knowledge, his frank yet dignified and gentlemanlike bearing in his private intercourse, his entire freedom from everything like concealment, duplicity, and stratagem,—all these were impressed more and more upon the minds and hearts of the young men, and they learned to love and revere him. In their playful moods they might, and were accustomed to mimic others, but they never could imitate Professor Murdock, for the entire absence of everything like mannerism, left them nothing to ape.

At an early period, however, difficulties in the practical working of the Institution began to present themselves; and Professor Murdock foreseeing that there were difficulties which were sure to attend his position, though he did not then understand their nature or origin, determined at once to resign his Professorship at Andover, and withdraw from the Institution; which resignation he tendered, in the Fall of 1820. It was not however accepted, and a modification of its duties, having, as was then supposed, been arranged jointly by the Founder of his Professorship and the Trustees of the Institution, Dr. Murdock withdrew his resignation. The troubles, however, which he had foreseen, soon became realities. First, the appropriate duties of his Professorship, which, in the language of the instrument of endowment, was now to be "the department of Ecclesiastical History as his *primary* service and duties," was interfered with, and he was obliged to see his department, and that too, contrary to a Memorial almost unanimously signed by the students, nearly ignored in the course of study; while he himself was crowded into the department of Sacred Rhetoric, from which he had been formally relieved, and for which, as was well known, he had no taste. This Memorial of the Students, of January, 1827, passed by an almost unanimous vote, and which was in itself an able and manly document,

brought matters to an immediate crisis. For it showed the position which Dr. Murdock occupied in the Seminary, the strong hold which he had upon the confidence of the students, and the high estimate in which both he and his department were now regarded by them. Desperate measures were now resolved upon by his assailants; and at the very next Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees it was voted that Dr. Murdock's connection with the Seminary be dissolved. All the secret documents pertaining to that transaction are now before us, and they are in several respects a curiosity. And yet, that vote of the Trustees, dismissing Professor Murdock from office, was the only answer to a formal and elaborate Memorial of the great body of the students, praying that Dr. Murdock's department might have its proper place in the course of study in the Seminary. The annoyances which, for many years, had been growing more and more virulent, now amounted to an open and bitter persecution; and the opposition, as we have seen, never relaxed its efforts until its end was accomplished, and he was driven from Andover Hill; nor did it cease even then. Had the tribunal to which the appeal was carried been some other than that which his too trusting nature led him to confide in, the result would, we have no doubt, have been different. So the ablest and most judicious counsel in the country warned him at the time. The history of that unhappy event we shall not now write, though the materials are before us in all their minute detail; but as an act of justice to one whom we believe to have been an innocent and a deeply injured man, we do not hesitate to say that the opposition began and was carried out, from first to last, in a spirit, which, alas! has power, when cherished, to deaden the moral sense, and pervert the judgment, even of good men.

But Dr. Murdock, though cast down was not destroyed. The noblest young men of the country rallied to his side, and poured their warmest sympathies into his wounded heart. And what is more, he lived to see the day when his chiefest accusers, they who had done most to cloud the bright prospects of his maturer years, to thwart his ripened plans of extensive usefulness, and, as was then thought, to effectually blight and destroy his reputation, volunteered a pretty full confession of the past to him, and it was mutually agreed that the past should be forgiven. He freely forgave, for he never cherished one feeling of resentment. All the parties to an affair which at that time filled no small space in the public mind, now sleep in their graves; and who will say that, in justice to all concerned, the record of the reconciliation should not be as

open and as public as was the occasion which called for it. Dr. Murdock felt in the closing years of his life that God had so overruled what seemed at first a most mysterious Providence, that his usefulness, reputation, and worldly comfort had all been promoted by a grievous wrong and an unmitigated evil. His last visit to Andover, where he spent the winter of 1852–3, was one of unalloyed pleasure to him, and he ever reverted to it with feelings of much satisfaction. Thus much we have felt it our duty to say concerning a period of his life, which, as we have already observed, we have no right to pass by in silence. We have used plainness of language, but we have spoken deliberately, and have not uttered one word more than belongs to one whom, in life, we loved, honored and revered, and over whose grave we offer this as a tribute most sacredly due to his character during this portion of his history—a tribute far less than his memory deserves.

Dr. Murdock was a thoroughly learned man. "There are," says one, "learned men, so-called, in modern times, who pick up scraps and ends of learning here and there—who take their knowledge chiefly at second hand, and who sometimes make quite a display in borrowed plumage. Dr. Murdock was not one of that sort, but was learned after the old fashion. While he was a pastor, he made himself a thorough Biblical scholar. The few Hebrew lessons which he had received under President Stiles were seed in a genial soil. Something in his family reading of the Scriptures happened, one day, to send him to the original. The chapter that morning—if we correctly remember the story as we heard it from his lips some four and thirty years ago—was the first chapter of Genesis. With the aid of lexicon and grammar he toiled through that chapter in the original text; and he thought that by some special effort he might read every day in his study the Hebrew of the morning chapter in the family. The attempt was made successfully. He read the Hebrew Bible through, and then read it again, till he was so familiar with it that for a while he read directly from the Hebrew into English in his family devotions. While he was professor at Burlington, he made himself acquainted with German, making a journey to Philadelphia for the sake of hearing the language spoken, and that at a time when Moses Stuart was almost the only scholar in New England who thought that German books could be made subsidiary to theological studies." Such a habit of patient, persistent study made Dr. Murdock at last one of the most profound scholars in the city, where he spent the larger part of his life, distinguished as it is for the number of its really learned men. He was surpassed by individ-

uals in various branches of learning; by one, in Arabic and Sanscrit; by another, in Hebrew; by another, in Greek Literature; by another, in Mathematics; by another, in Mineralogy, Geology and Physical Science; and yet several of these departments were favorite studies with him; and in them he was capable of filling a Professorship in any college of our country with distinction; while in comparative Philology; in the number of Ancient and Modern Languages at his command; in Ancient and Modern Philosophy; in Ecclesiastical and Civil History; in acquaintance with Society and the progress of Civilization in all ages of the world, he had, we think, no peer. The variety and fullness of his resources, the perfect accuracy of his knowledge, and his readiness in making his learning available on an emergency, have often surprised even his most intimate acquaintances. We might illustrate this remark by an account of his private correspondence, in which his aid was sought on a great variety of subjects, and by educated gentlemen in every part of the country. Thus we find him writing to one distinguished scholar, on the *impassibility* of the Divine Nature; to another, on the Nature of the Atonement; to another, on the mode of Baptism in the Primitive Church; to another, on the present phase of German Pantheism; to another, assisting in the translation of a Syriac Manuscript; to another, suggesting the probable meaning of the Phenician Inscription; to another, on the exegesis of a difficult text in the Greek of the New Testament, &c. &c.; and this correspondence continued to the very close of his life.

Of course Dr. Murdock was a dangerous man to that clas who attempt to do business in the learned world on a stock of what they call original genius, in other words, to conceited superficialists and flatulent pretenders. He weighed them at a glance, avoided them when he well could, was always kind to them, never disputed with them; but if really brought into collision with them, seldom had occasion to encounter them more than once. If he had not the gift of keen and withering sarcasm of his late learned friend, Professor Kingsley, he had an equal contempt for noisy charlatans in Literature and Science. It would not be difficult to collect a fund of anecdotes illustrating this feature of his character, as rich as any gathered from the life of Sydney Smith, though, we are happy to say, of a somewhat different character; for he never trifled needlessly with personal feelings, and never, under any circumstances, with religious and sacred things.

Dr. Murdock was not what is usually called a brilliant man. That is, if a vigorous imagination, a lively fancy, a fondness for splendid theories, a habit of saying or attempting to say,

dazzling, sparkling, and witty things, a love of mere eloquence of style—if these are necessary to constitute a brilliant man, he certainly never craved such a reputation. But if, and especially at the period when Dr. Murdock came upon the stage—a period when the *prestige* of old-fashioned ultra-New England Calvinism was passing rapidly away, if a well-balanced mind which resisted all tendencies to extremes; a wise sagacity to detect the permanent amid the transient, to search for, perceive, and hold fast, the Truth of God in distinction from the mere Philosophy of Truth; if boldness to throw off the traditional shackles of a school, and to follow fearlessly where an enlightened judgment led him; if a keenness of searching analysis which nothing escaped, and a synthetic grasp which brought the whole field of vision fairly into view, everything in its own order and connection; if a style of writing, clear as crystal, the reflex of his own style of thought; if a wonderful familiarity with the wisdom and learning of past ages, and a retentive memory, which seemed to hold everything which he ever read within its grasp; and yet all this combined with an unobtrusive modesty which instinctively shrunk from everything like personal display; if such manly, gigantic features of mind and heart make a man truly great, then Dr. Murdock was such a man beyond a doubt. Dr. Murdock's mind, to sum its prominent features in a single sentence, was accurate in its perceptions, far-reaching in its grasp, strictly logical and philosophical in its judgments, thoroughly independent in its conclusions and fearless in its determinations. Once sure that he was right, and it was little matter to him who, or how many agreed, or disagreed with him. Truth was to him not a question of majorities and minorities.

Dr. Murdock possessed, in an eminent degree, honesty and truthfulness of character. Whether in the intercourse of private life, or in his public writings as a scholar and historian, few men we believe ever lived more entirely free from everything like a habit of exaggeration. In his estimates of character, in his opinions of men and things, in his statements of historic facts bearing on points of controversy, he seemed ever to bring to the point before him a mind wholly free from bias and partiality. And hence, while in familiar intercourse he was one of the most charitable of men—and few ever heard him speak unkindly of any man—and while he was one of the most agreeable and profitable of companions, so this habit has given to his works, as an author, reliability and confidence in the public mind. This exact truthfulness of statement, which in his mind had all the sacredness of the most religious obligation, qualified, we need not say, in a strong degree, his approbation of some of the more popular Histories of the day. He rarely read them; and when

did, his marginal notes and references showed with what sparing fidelity he sat in judgment on their loose, unguarded, perverted narratives. Those only who knew him well, know th what reverence he looked upon truthfulness of character, l especially as an attribute of the historian.

Dr. Murdock was, more than almost any man whom we ever ew, a man of strict system and method in his habits. He l his fixed hours for sleep, for exercise, and for labor; and m these he never varied except under extraordinary cir-nstances. He was an early riser, and in the winter often rted for his vigorous morning walk before the morning ht had begun to dawn. And to this systematic course of ing he was indebted for the almost uninterrupted health ich he enjoyed, as also for the vast amount of intellectual or which he performed. He was aided by this habit too, we ıbt not, in the attainment of that equanimity of temper in ich he always appeared even to his most intimate friends. w ever saw him off his guard; or, even amid the most trying nes of life, otherwise than under the most perfect self-control. ı seemed, indeed, to those who did not know him well, to ve schooled himself into an almost stoical indifference to ınts which agitate and disturb most men. And yet he was a n of deep feelings, sensitive in his nature, and strong in his achments. In this respect, his life was in strong contrast with ı hap-hazard way of living, and thinking, and acting, which ıracterizes so large a portion of mankind.

In this connection we are permitted to give the following imate of Dr. Murdock's character, drawn by one who had g known him well, and who is himself one of the most ment of American scholars.

'The characteristics of Dr. Murdock, as a student, which have im-ssed themselves on my mind are the following:—CANDOR, CON-NTIOUSNESS, DISCRIMINATION and THOROUGHNESS. I will ven-e to make a remark on three of these, omitting any notice of the rd, not from any doubt of its applicability, but because its illustra-ı requires a better and more minute acquaintance with his works than I ess. I beg leave to premise that these remarks are merely suggestive.

'CANDOR.—It always appeared to me that Dr. M. possessed a very ral mind. Love of truth seemed to be its governing principle, and to meate it as a constituent element. Of course, like most men of d feeling, he was attached to the system of that ecclesiastical body in ich his early associations and habits were formed, and therefore he ered to it. But his natural kindness of disposition, and widely ex-ded circle of varied knowledge, disposed and enabled him to take e and liberal views, and to recognize and appreciate excellence rever it should be found. The same characteristic led him to make

allowance for prejudice of education, and for limited views of truth in persons whose mental horizon was from any cause circumscribed. A calm, dispassionate, and careful investigation of all the literary or scientific evidence bearing on any difficult or controverted topic, coöperated with a sincere desire to secure light and truth.

"Conscientiousness.—This revered servant of God was conscientious in his habits as a student, and in their practical development. The great object to which he devoted his attention through a long life was, to acquire such moral, religious, philosophical, and general knowledge as tend to elevate the human character; and then to employ these important acquisitions of learned wealth so as to promote the good of others. Such was the sphere of action in which Divine Providence had placed him. And like some celestial planet he pursued his onward course, scattering the warmth of his character, and the light of his mind, all around him. His sense of duty led him to devote much of his time to study, in order that he might be the better qualified to edify by his personal instructions and various publications. He willingly relinquished ease and comfort for the tedious, often unsatisfactory, and sometimes painful investigation of doubtful and obscure points, when the general course of thought and examination required him to do so. And at an advanced period of life, when most men feel that nature requires repose, and are rather inclined to be self-indulgent than to make much vigorous effort, this energetic old man opens a new road for his exertions in the good cause to which he had devoted his whole being. It is said of Cato that he acquired Greek late in life, beginning the study of it when about sixty years of age. But when ten years older, the subject of this notice applied himself to the Syriac language, in order to become competent to translate into English the venerable Version of the New Testament, which was made in that very ancient tongue soon after the age of the Apostles. And he succeeded, and the noble volume is now before the world, a monument of the enterprise, industry, ability, conscientiousness, and practical religious feeling of the venerable learner and translator.

"Thoroughness.—Dr. Murdock's scholarship was thorough. The elements of his character already mentioned very naturally led him to investigate deeply every subject which engaged his attention. The candor and religious tone of his mind would not permit him to rest satisfied with any partial examination. He knew that conclusions based on such examinations must be unfair, and he was too honest to be satisfied with such. It was his purpose to investigate all the data to which he had access; and that not superficially, but carefully, thoroughly, repeatedly, until all the groundwork or elements of truth which they might contain should be completely mastered. And to do this, his natural abilities, well cultivated mind, and steady habits of industry peculiarly fitted him. In preparing a literary notice of any publication, he did not content himself with loose, indiscriminate eulogy or censure, or with some general observations on the subject of the production, such as might be written by one of limited and imperfect knowledge. He made himself acquainted with the character of the book by a careful perusal of its

contents, and then brought to bear upon it the stores of his own well furnished mental repository. For illustration I would refer to his notice in the Church Review of Dr. Turner's work on the 'Jewish Rabbies.' Instead of any superficial and general remark on Hebrew Literature, the reader will perceive at once that the subject is handled by one whose competency to express an opinion is the result of an examination of Rabbinical writers themselves, and of some of the best sources of information on the subject. Dr. Murdock made no learned pretence. The Pierian waters that he had drunk were drawn from the bottom of the spring, and he presents them for the refreshment of his readers in their original purity."

We are permitted also to give the following extract from a Sermon preached at the opening of the first term in the year 1856, at the Chapel of Andover Theological Seminary, by the Rev. Prof. E. A. Park, D. D.:

"During our recess from this place, a venerable servant of God, who was once a pastor of this Church, and a teacher in this venerable School; one who, three years ago, stood at this Communion Table, and with beaming eye reached out its expressive emblems to us, his friends and admirers, has been called to his everlasting rest. He was a man of large learning and a good heart. He was patient in toil, and his perseverance, even through his old age, in acquiring knowledge, won our highest esteem. In the decline of life he had the enthusiasm of a youthful student. More and more unreservedly, as he drew near the grave, did he consecrate his affluence of learning to his Redeemer. His faith in Christ became more and more simple. He loved the doctrines that cluster around the Atonement. He died as he had lived, trusting in that Atonement, and his faith has not disappointed him. Many sorrows pressed down upon him during his protracted course on earth; but they chastened his spirit, and fitted him under the kindly influences of heavenly Grace for his peaceful departure to the better land. And as we come together at the beginning of a new Seminary year, does not he form one of the great cloud of witnesses who compass us round about, and while we pray, they praise, and while we praise, they triumph; for they have 'come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'"

There is one fact in connection with the Rev. Dr. Murdock which deserves in this connection to be recorded and perpetuated. The "Church Review" was projected as early as the winter of 1846 and '47, by the present Editor, in connection with the Rev. James Mackay, now of Inverness, Scotland, a thorough scholar and an elegant writer. Our Circulars were issued, responses were received, and plans formed for the speedy issue of the work, when Mr. Mackay's unexpected removal from the country interrupted our arrangements, and threatened to put an end to the enterprise. As for ourselves, we shrunk from the un-

dertaking, and if left to our own wishes should have at once given it up, as, indeed, we had already determined to do. It was at this period that the Rev. Dr. Murdock reassured us, and by his words of encouragement nerved us up to a labor, the responsibility of which was in some imperfect degree felt, though little of its difficulties was appreciated. From that day he took a warm interest in the Review. Every page of it, from beginning to end, he read until the day of his death, and though differing widely from its principles on some points, was to the very last one of its firmest and best friends. The large-hearted liberality, and invariable kindness with which he looked upon the earnest and bold enunciation of principles which we hold sacred, but which were foreign to his views, will ever be to us a pleasing and grateful recollection. He was also a contributor to the Church Review, and besides several learned Notices of important works, the Articles on the "Syriac Ignatian Epistles," in July, 1849; on "Modern Pantheism," in July, 1851; on "Gibbon Confronted," in October, 1854; and on "Modern Millenarianism," in January, 1856, were from his learned pen.

At a period like the present, when Infidelity, more than usually noisy and insolent, is claiming to take Natural and Physical Science under its wing, and is beginning to declare oracularly that there are contradictions between the teachings of Revelation and the discoveries of Modern Science, it may be well to hear the testimony of such a man as Dr. Murdock, as to the claims of Christianity.

"His witness on this point was not more intelligent than decided. Only a few months before his death, he remarked in substance to a friend that the whole result of his investigations had been to confirm the simple faith of his early years. And we have reason to know that as his wisdom ripened, as his soul drew near to the solemn aspects of another world, and above all, as the calm decline of old age led his intellect back from the cold, proud heights of mere learning into the region of feeling and desire, where the heart if knit to Christ, enjoys a perpetual youth; we have reason to know that as these processes went on, he regarded with increasing suspicion all philosophical refinements of Revealed Truth, and all the quibbling cavils of modern sceptics, and reposed with a more undoubting confidence upon the great facts and elementary verities of the Christian system." Dr. Murdock never, we think, had any sympathy with the tendency always so strong in New England towards a speculative and metaphysical Theology. And the Philosophy of the Schoolmen, which more or less underlies all New England Divinity, a Philosophy which limits the attributes, declares the purposes, and judges the motives of the Supreme Being,—

a Philosophy which crept into the Church as early as the sixth century,—this whole system of metaphysical speculation never, we believe, had any share of Dr. Murdock's confidence. And yet the formal expression of doctrine, as always held by the orthodox of New England, Dr. Murdock received and maintained. And we know with what intense dislike he viewed recent attempts to graft a German Neological element into the theology of New England, and that too on the part of men who are but the merest novices in German Literature and learning. He understood too well the character of the genuine article to be taken with such a miserable pinch-beck imitation. Dr. Murdock's thorough distrust, and rejection even, of all metaphysical refinements and speculations in theology, and his most cordial reception of the great distinctive doctrinal facts of the Gospel, were strong points in his character, on which there is no room for dispute. And such distrust in the case of one, like him, capable of detecting the subtlest metaphysical distinctions, and his most cordial belief in the simple facts and truths of Divine Revelation as they have ever been held and taught in the Church, is a fact not without its value at the present day, when men claiming to be scholars are seeking to undermine public confidence in God's written Word.

If we were to attempt a complete portrait of Dr. Murdock's character, we should need to speak of his early orphanage, and his being thus led to the formation of habits of self-reliance; of his insatiable thirst for knowledge, and his early efforts to procure a Latin Grammar and Dictionary, which were studied at first secretly, and only in the intervals of severe manual labor; of his character in maturer life, and especially as a pastor, preacher, and college professor, in each of which relations he won that enviable distinction which the true metal always receives over its tawdry counterfeit; we should need also to describe more particularly several traits in his character to which we can now only allude; such as his entire freedom in his advancing years from the infirmities of temper which often characterize old age, as petulance and moroseness—his youthfulness and vivacity of feeling, and his pleasure in witnessing and ministering to the enjoyment of others—his amiability and kindness of manner, by which he won the hearts of children to himself—his taste for theoretical and practical mechanics—his thorough familiarity with the political and civil affairs and changes among the nations of the earth—his interest in the progress of modern discovery—his remarkable talent for conversation, and his power of adapting himself to all classes of society, so that there were few employments and pursuits in which he did not seem perfectly at home. Indeed, there was in him such

a versatility of talent, and such a variety, fullness, and accuracy of resources, such an evenness and symmetry of character, as rendered him, in our judgment, one of the most remarkable of men.

In looking back upon the life and character of Dr. Murdock, there is one respect especially in which that life deserves to be held up as an example to the young professional men of the present day; and that is, the persistence with which he kept up, even to the last, the habits of a diligent student. See him, for example, at the age of seventy years, the fatal three-score and ten, when most persons yield to the infirmities of old age, yet see the venerable Doctor catching a glimpse of the New Testament, the Life and labors of the MESSIAS, in the very vernacular of the Apostles themselves. Its freshness of manner and style, its simplicity and evident truthfulness of meaning, at once arrest his attention. He can at first get no good Grammar of the Ancient Syriac; and so he *makes* one for himself, tracing out step by step the forms and conjugations of the Syriac Verbs; and doing the whole with an air of perfect neatness and scholarly elegance which would have charmed an old copyist of the Middle Ages. At last his work is done; and we of the nineteenth century are permitted for the first time to follow in the footsteps of the Apostles, and hear them not in the pure and classic Greek of the Schools, but in their own simple and artless way tell how they understood the GREAT LIVING TEACHER. Of all his literary labors there was none to which he reverted with more pleasure than to this translation of the Syriac New Testament.

Dr. Murdock, just before his last journey to the South, entered thoroughly upon the study of the Arabic language; and here the same old trouble met him, the want of a really good Arabic Grammar; and he met the difficulty now as he had met it nearly ten years before. We have before us, in almost the last handwriting of the venerable octogenarian, the full conjugations of the Arabic Verbs, regular, irregular and defective, &c., in which he noted and marked every change in form and signification with that same precision and elegance which would become the youthful student of twenty years. Beyond a question this is one of the most wonderful productions of the Nineteenth Century; it shows that the intellect and heart of the American people are not altogether given up to the grossness of material pursuits; it is an achievement which at least will not suffer in comparison with the proudest material triumphs of those whom this physical and commercial age regards as its great and successful men. Nor ought such an example to be lost, especially upon the young students of our country. And yet see how most

of them at their very entrance upon the active duties of their profession, at once throw away their Latin and Greek Classics, their Hebrew and Greek Bibles, lose all relish for active study, read little else than the newspaper and pictorial literature of the day, and soon degenerate into the mere dull and stupid perfunctorist, and their official teachings become little else than an endlessly recurring series of stale truisms and empty platitudes. There is, after all, but one path to the Temple of Wisdom; and the life of Dr. Murdock is proof that patient, persevering, life-long labor is absolutely indispensable to him who would successfully follow after it.

We have omitted till now to speak of the most important feature in Dr. Murdock's character; that is, as a religious man. His own description of himself, as given to his Class in 1847, and published in their "Memoirs," is, that "He is a strict Congregationalist, associates with the orthodox, but calls no man master. Without attaining full assurance, he has never relinquished his hope of salvation through divine grace. He is familiar with death and the grave, and relying on the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ, he is calmly and cheerfully waiting for the time when he must bid adieu to all sublunary things." Dr. Murdock thus declares himself to be a "strict Congregationalist;" and such he was, and a thoroughly consistent one. If any of the readers of the *Church Review* are disposed to ask, how a man of such unquestionable learning could adopt and hold tenaciously Congregational notions of Church Order and government, we can only answer by quoting the following Question and Answer from the "Congregational Catechism," of which he was mostly the author.

"Ques. 7. What authority has the *mere* example or practice of the Apostolic age in respect to the organization and government of churches?"

"Ans. It has not the authority of a *law*, obligatory upon all succeeding ages; but it is an exemplification of Apostolic wisdom and prudence, in adopting suitable rules and regulations for the infant churches, in that age and state of the world."

Dr. Murdock's personal religious character was much more a matter of principle than of mere emotion. It was not destitute of emotion; for he had within him a fountain of deep feeling, of the intensity of which a stranger would not dream. For one, whose calm, contemplative mind had gone over the whole subject of personal religion with such deep anxiety and such searching analysis—its nature, its reliability, the ground of his own personal belief and hopes, such a mind had within itself depths of emotion not less real, because, like the majestic river, noiseless. And yet his religion was manifested in the

the systematic and
and private duties
the language of
in earnest and living
his last sickness.
the lamps of the Gospel.
hours: "Those
told that he had
the death-summons; and, a
patiently and serenely
No cloud was
nor the least aberr
harass him during his co
even in health, so hi
high impulses and exu
by the *firm trusting*
entering to that withi
visited him as often as
interview had his heart gr
earnest faith, fervent love,
the spirit land."
lived and die in the mid
was very strong—for he
when assured that
quelled all anxiety, and
earth will soon be sev
His last act on e
his hand, even then c
bright and beautiful la
upon his depa
him, faith is now lo
as we feel, a mo
character, of the Rev.
his name and of his
endeavors. He has er
and he will live as lo
the hearts of a Christian
reputation will, we
imperfect description of
discharged a pa
over the memory o
private virtues, as for
and reputation will b
gratitude and respect of his fellow

Art. III.—THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT.

1. *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies.* Historical Sketches by a Minister of the Presbyterian Church. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855.
2. *The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland*, or John Knox's Book of Common Order, as prescribed by the General Assembly, and used in the Church of Scotland at and after the Reformation. Edited and carefully revised by the Rev. John Cumming, M. A., Minister of the Scotch Church, Crown Court, Little Russel Street, Covent Garden. London: 1840.
3. *Mercersburg Quarterly Review.* July, 1856. Art. I.—Liturgical Worship. By a Presbyterian Divine.

The publications, whose titles we have given above, are among the many indications now existing, of what may very properly be called a Liturgical Movement. It is very certain that there is such a movement, both in England and America, among those who have been hitherto most deeply prejudiced against all Forms of Worship. What will be the issue of this movement, and how far it will carry those who are engaged in it, no one can foresee, as yet; but that there is a reality about it, and that it will result in something, no one can doubt who is at all familiar with the subject. It is now about fifteen years since Dr. Cumming, the popular Scotch preacher of London, published the Old Liturgy of the Church of Scotland, with a carefully written preface, in which he ventures the opinion that "for the great mass of people, the partial use of a form of prayer would be truly valuable." This book, at last, attracted the attention of the Edinburgh Review, and an elaborate article, written evidently by a Presbyterian, and which is altogether favorable to a partial introduction of a Liturgy into the Church of Scotland, makes these four points as the result of an independent Scriptural examination of the subject:

"1. That the Lord's Prayer is the only form of words, the use of which is enjoined in the New Testament.

"2. That the uniform practice both of Christ and his Apostles was such as to indicate their approval of ritual prayers.

"3. That extempore public prayer, on ordinary occasions, is nowhere recommended or even sanctioned.

"4. That extempore prayer, even in public on extraordinary occasions, is sanctioned by Apostolic example."

The evident design of the writer in the Edinburgh Review, is to advocate the use of Forms in public worship.

Under the title of Eutaxia, expressive of the beauty and order of Divine Service, a Presbyterian clergyman of this country, a son of Dr. Baird, (we name the Author or Editor with pleasure, for the high tone and Churchly spirit of his book,) has published the Genevan and the Scottish Liturgies, Baxter's Reformed Liturgy, The Reformed Dutch Liturgy and the Palatinate Liturgy, &c., &c., with interesting historical sketches, serving to show that early Presbyterianism was not opposed to Forms, and also, indirectly, that the use of Forms is not inconsistent with the deepest spirit of devotion. The work is very happily conceived and executed, and it cannot fail to exert a very healthful influence, wherever it is read. The object which the Author has in view, appears in the following quotation:

"It is quite evident that it (the Directory of Worship) * * * * does not meet all the wants of public devotion, nor answer all the ends of an aid to public prayer. It defines and arranges the parts of Divine Service; but it does not furnish forms of language suitable for their expression. The ready assistance to the minister in conducting, and to the people in following oral supplications, is not supplied by a work whose whole object is to state and describe the constituent elements of worship. There is a necessity palpable and widely felt, for something more than this, to meet the exigencies of the case.

"Does the Presbyterian Church allow or contemplate any such subsidiary provision for the celebration of public worship? Are her ministers interdicted the use of sound and well conceived formularies; and are they shut up to the necessity of original composition for the most solemn, difficult, and trying function of their office, without even the right of previous preparation for the task?

"There is in the Church of Christ a rich and copious literature of devotion, accumulated by the consecrated labors of many ages. Holy men of prayer have been gifted at some periods, as few can claim to be now, with elevation of thought and language necessary for the adequate expression of devout feeling. The period of Primitive zeal produced such minds. The period of reformation in the Church brought out others. Are we, in less favored days, debarred from the fruits of these high spiritual endowments? Do Ecclesiastical rules exclude us from the use of the best liturgical compositions, and force us to rely on our individual resources of conception, however crude and meager, and immature we may find them?

"Such is, undoubtedly, the popular conception of the matter; and the fact of its general, if not universal prevalence, has led me to attempt an exhibition of the true theory, and the normal practice of our Church in this particular. It will be my object to demonstrate, first, that the principles of Presbyterianism in no wise conflict with the discretionary use of written forms; and secondly, that the practice of Presbyterian Churches abundantly warrants the adoption and the use of such forms."

An Article in the Princeton Review, which is ascribed to Prof. Hodge, commends the argument of Eutaxia to the favorable notice of its readers, and openly advocates a reform in the public worship of the Presbyterian Church.

That there is a reality in this movement, is apparent from the incidental information that is given of the necessity of some action in this matter to sustain the interest of public worship, and to meet the increasing power and attractiveness of the Church of England, and of her daughter in America.

In Scotland there have been large accessions to the English Church. "A large body of persons," says the writer in the Edinburgh Review, from whom we have already quoted, "for the most part of the highest class, as regards both station and intelligence, is withdrawn from the National Church because they greatly prefer the English Church Service to extemporaneous prayer; and was it wise to alienate them, or is it prudent to keep them estranged on such grounds? If a large body of her members call for a Liturgy, is it wise, or prudent, or right, to withhold it?" When people talk in that way, it is clear that they are in earnest.

Says the Duke of Argyle: "Among the numerous families of Scotland, who, since the Reformation, but more frequently in later times, have left the communion of Presbytery and joined that of the English Church, very few have been induced to do so by any previous conversion to Church principles. * * * * But the deeper source of the *extensive alienation which has taken place*, is to be found in the superior attractions of a more ritual worship, in the weakness of a predominantly dogmatic and informal system to keep up permanent attachment in times of religious peace, as well as in some more positive objection to which such a system is exposed." The testimony on this side of the water is precisely similar.

"The experiment," says Mr. Baird, "of that mode of dealing with the subject of Public Worship, by which everything is left to the unaided individuality of the Minister, has been fully tried. For nearly two centuries, in the face of all historic precedents, at variance with all other denominations of Christians, and in conflict with their own earlier principles and practice, the Calvinistic Churches of Great Britain and the United States have faithfully adhered to this method, unknown in Ecclesiastical experience, before the sittings of the Westminster Assembly. We believe that the times are drawing near, when, by general attestation, that method will be pronounced defective. * * * * No candid person, familiar with the actual condition of our churches, can refuse to confront this fact: that by so much as the public worship of God may be rendered attractive, may awaken interest and excite and sustain devotional feeling; by so much have we lost power and influence as a church. * * * Evidently the young are not drawn into our congregations by any beauty or impressiveness of our services; their attachment is not won by interest in the devotional exercises of the sanctuary."

A Presbyterian Divine, in the last July Number of the Mercersburg Quarterly Review, whose name we would like well to know, and to whose Article we shall soon refer, thus

bears his testimony to the wide-spread feeling of dissatisfaction among the Calvinistic bodies:

"It is a simple matter of fact which we feel constrained to account for upon purely intrinsic reasons, that the Episcopal congregations of our land are the most faithful among us, to their own form of worship. * * * * It is equally a matter of fact, that the unliturgic churches of our land have not that in their mode of service which has succeeded, after any positive sort, in exciting the enthusiasm or winning the hearty love of the people. On the contrary, the general unsatisfactoriness of the extemporal service, has come to be a matter of serious complaint. It is painful, but it is truth, and the acknowledging of the truth will do us good. * * * * To our mind, the fact of an inattentive and irreverent congregation, is a momentous wrong; and we hold that if the Liturgy offers to correct this state of things, then it is the Church's duty to make the trial."

This testimony is sufficient, we believe, to show that there is an unwonted interest manifesting itself among the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies of Christians. The Dutch Reformed Church is openly discussing a revision of their Liturgy, with a view to its more general adoption. We are confirmed in the opinion that this is no mere passing interest—no temporary and spasmodic movement, from the fact that it is in harmony with our advancing civilization. The taste of our people is becoming more refined and cultivated, of which we have full proof in many forms of social life.

Church architecture and Church Music are receiving in our day no little share of attention. The old prejudice against Gothic Churches and against chanting is fast wearing out, and there is a strong taste growing up among large classes of Christian people for beauty in the worship of God. All this feeling points directly to Liturgical worship, and makes the inconveniences of the extemporaneous mode more manifest.

But, our readers will observe that in this whole movement there is not the first sign of deep Church feeling—no longing for unity, no sense of the evils or the sin of schism, no doubts as to the essential rightfulness of the position of the various denominations into which we are divided. That there are those, here and there, who are led to the adoption of Church principles, we know, but certainly there is no movement in this direction, and nothing that will give us any ground to hope for a speedy change in the relative position of the Christian bodies towards each other. This movement is strictly denominational and sectarian, and the various sects that separated from the Church of England, desiring all the time to be as much unlike her as possible, are now, many of them, seeking to adopt as measures of self-preservation the very thing which their ancestors discarded.

And to this peculiarity we desire to call special attention, rom its bearing on the Liturgical questions which are now the ubject of discussion in our own Communion. It has been eriously argued that our Liturgy, with its fixed forms, is a bar o Church Unity; that there are many persons ready to adopt Episcopacy, who are deterred by its accompaniment of an nvarying Worship, and that if we would allow these persons omething of that liberty to which they are accustomed, we hould receive large accessions to the Church. Now, we con-ess, we have no very great respect for this argument of expe-iency. We are somewhat familiar with the reasoning with hich the non-conformists strove to vindicate their course which esulted in their separation from the Church of England, and ve doubt not, in the least, there were good reasons for not yield-ng to their many frivolous demands.

But there is now, so far as we are able to perceive, no such lass of persons in existence. There is no body of men any-here, that would be conciliated or attracted to the Church, by Liturgical concessions. We might reduce ourselves entirely to he level of the non-Liturgic bodies around us, so far as Wor-hip is concerned, without advancing in the least the cause of Episcopacy, or Church Unity. How many Congregational, or Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Baptist clergymen, would be in-luced thereby to receive Ordination at the hands of a Bishop f the Church? How many laymen of these several bodies would forsake their pastors from a feeling of the sin of schism? The truth is, the whole tendency of things, from the natural working of sectarianism, has been downward from the begin-ning of the Non-Conformist movement, and though there are ome signs of a reaction in our day, yet that reaction has com-menced, if at all, just where it naturally would commence, in hose matters which are obvious to all, in the Worship of the Church. There is no proof that the Calvinistic bodies, (we use his term simply for convenience,) are in the least softened to-wards Prelacy, or suspect that they are guilty of the sin of Schism; but they are beginning to perceive, that their way of Worship is inferior to the old Church way that they abandoned, and so they are determined to adopt that way, in part at least, and perpetuate as long as possible the separation.

Let us see what chance there is of their success. Will they be able to return to Primitive and Churchly Forms of Worship? It is said of the late President Dwight, of Yale College, that when a brother clergyman enquired why they could not have a Liturgy, as well as the Church people, (of which they greatly stood in need to restrain the irregularities of Worship,) he

simply answered him by the enquiry, "Who shall prepare it?" And this is the difficulty which every person who has written on the subject has, tacitly at least, acknowledged. It is conceded on all sides that no Doctors in Divinity, no General Assemblies, nor Associations in our day, are able to *compose* a Liturgy; but it is maintained that a Liturgy may be compiled out of preëxisting forms, and some there are who would make the Calvinistic forms the basis, and others who would take the earlier Rituals; and these, they think, if modified to suit the times, could meet the wants of the present day. Now we have strong doubts whether it is possible to revive the Liturgies of Calvin or of Knox, and still stronger doubts, whether any modification of the Ancient Liturgies can meet and satisfy the spirit of modern Presbyterianism or Independency.

The history of Puritanic Liturgies has not been such as to inspire much hope respecting them. What has it been but a history of failures? There are a few facts in this connection that are full of meaning. In 1557, the Liturgy of Knox was sent over into England. It was sent over to be used in England. It was dedicated to his brethren in England. The Non-Conformists were not satisfied even with the second Book of Edward; Knox never heartily approved the English Liturgy; he thought it savored of the ancient superstition, and therefore from his safe retreat he sent over to his suffering brethren, his ideal of a pure and Scriptural Liturgy. How far this Liturgy of Knox was used in England we have no means of knowing; but in Scotland, when the Presbyterian religion was established, it became the common order of the Church. It was established as the Scottish Liturgy.

But the Scotch Presbyterians soon wearied of their Liturgy. It gradually fell out of use. No one knows when it was at last abandoned, but at the end of a quarter of a century there was not probably a Church in the kingdom where the Liturgy of Knox or any other Liturgy was used, and at the end of a hundred years, at the Meeting of the Westminster Assembly, the Kirk of Scotland joined with the Presbyterians of England in establishing the Directory of Worship. This is the first fact. The Liturgy of Knox not only failed in England when placed side by side with the Church Liturgy, but it failed in Scotland when it had free scope and was supported by authority.

The history of the Directory of Worship is not more encouraging. At the sitting of the Westminster Assembly, the Church of England was entirely prostrate, her Liturgy was proscribed and her clergy scattered. Presbyterianism was in the ascending and the Kirk of Scotland formally abandoning its Common

Order which it had not in fact used for many years, adopted the Directory of Worship, which was thus established over the two Kingdoms. But this Directory not only failed to assert itself, and to gain a hold upon the English nation, but it has not been an actual directory of worship to those in England, Scotland or America who acknowledge the Westminster Assembly.

The Conference of the Savoy was the last attempt to reconcile the Puritans and Non-Conformists to the Church of England. The English Prayer Book was submitted to the severest tests. Its enemies were allowed to muster all their strongest arguments against it, nor were they slow to avail themselves of their privilege; and at last they presented a New Liturgy, composed by the celebrated Richard Baxter, which they prayed might be adopted, as well as the Order, and that either of them might be used at the discretion of the minister.

It certainly was not to be expected that the Church party would do otherwise than reject with something of contempt a Liturgy which was constructed on the principle of excluding almost everything that had been formerly in use, but it might have been expected that the Non-Conformists, beaten and repulsed and ridiculed for their presumption, would have esteemed highly this Liturgy which they had thought worthy to be placed side by side with the Prayer Book of the Church of England, and would have used it, all the more zealously and pertinaciously for the contempt that had been put upon it. But it was not so. Baxter's Reformed Liturgy, rejected by the Church, was never adopted by the Non-Conformists; it fell everywhere into practical contempt.

Now these experiments will serve to show that it is no easy thing to make a Liturgy, and impose it on a people; nor is it any easier to impose a dead Liturgy upon them. These reformative Liturgies are not available in our day, for the same reason that they never were available. They were *impositions;* and this is the precise difference between them and the Prayer Book of the Church of England, which is nothing else than the old Service of the Church reformed. The Church of England did not need a Liturgy, nor was the man living that could have composed a Liturgy that would have been received. Her Liturgy had been the growth of centuries; it was rooted in the affections of her people, its words were as music in their ears, its varied Festivals and Fasts had hallowed the whole Christian year. With the reformation of religion there was of course a revision of the Church's Liturgy, but that revision was conducted on the principle of retaining all, in substance and in form, that could be retained. *This*, which was the great

offense in the eyes of the Puritans, was the special excellence and glory of the English Reformation.

The Mercersburg Reviewer is astonished at the immeasurable superiority of the Prayer Book to the Liturgies of Calvin, Knox, and Baxter; and the Edinburgh Quarterly is forced to say that "the Liturgy of the Church of England, notwithstanding some faults, is, perhaps, the most perfect of existing Liturgies." Now it is very pleasant to hear these acknowledgments, which we might greatly multiply; because it was by alledging manifold and deadly errors in the Prayer Book, that the Fathers of the Presbyterians and Independents sought to justify their separation from the Church of England; and if the Prayer Book be so excellent as many of them are now ready to acknowledge, then this separation was entirely without justifying cause.

But it was not the intrinsic excellence of the Prayer Book, as contrasted with the Calvinistic Liturgies, that gave it favor. The English people did not calmly choose between the two and decide upon the merits of the case. This Prayer Book of the Church of England, after all the changes that it underwent through a long period of revision, gave still to her sons and daughters the Old Creeds, the Old Psalms and Hymns, and spiritual songs that their souls loved; they still heard the voice to which they had been accustomed to yield glad submission, and and hence while the Liturgies of the Reformation, as the Edinburgh Review declares, are probably less known to the Christians of England and America than the Liturgies of Antioch and Cæsarea, and many persons know not that such Liturgies were ever used, the Prayer Book of the Church of England has lost nothing of its hold on the affectionate reverence of the millions who now find its ancient and time hallowed forms a fit expression of their most profound religious feelings.

And as the endeavor to construct and impose a Liturgy has always proved a failure, so must the endeavors to revive and to impose on any people who have not been trained to them, the Ancient Liturgies. The Mercersburg Reviewer, abandoning the Calvinistic Offices as hopeless, looks to the old Liturgies for help.

He says:

"Why cannot we do what the English Church did, cast off the errors which have accrued to them, mingle the work of the Reformation with them, and adopt them? Why fatigue our souls to no purpose with original attempts in a region which, may we not say, the Head of the Church has already fitted to our hand? For our own part we may say so without hesitation. It is our opinion, that the anaphoral offices of the Liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, bear upon a scriptural comparison, far more Divine marks than the communion or baptismal forms which it has been our lot to find in the pulpits of our Churches."

The answer to these earnest questions is obvious. It is impossible for any body of men, at this day, to do what the Church of England did three hundred years ago. For, that work was a process in her real life. The Church inherited the Ancient Liturgies; they were hers of right, and she "mingled the work of the Reformation with them," because the reformation was an era in her natural life. When the Church of England, under the impulse of the new movement which she felt, proceeded to a careful examination of the Ancient Liturgies; it was with the view of seeing how much of her own loved Ritual she might retain; how many of those Forms which had been long endeared to her children she might continue still to use. The Church of England was never in the condition when she was required to *construct* a Liturgy; she had only to reform her Worship and to purify it; and in fact, this reformation was conducted by men not anxious for change, and who did not seek to make their own impressions a rule for the whole Church of Christ.

To impose a Liturgy constructed out of the Ancient Offices, upon the Presbyterians of our day, would be a work radically different from anything that was accomplished in the reformation of the English Service.

We conclude, therefore, that it is not possible for the Presbyterians, or Independents, ever to enjoy the blessings of a Liturgy through any process of construction that they may devise; but if this movement were to lead the more thoughtful of them to a reconsideration of the grounds of separation, to a calm weighing of the arguments urged by their very zealous ancestors against the Book of Common Prayer, we should hope that many of them would discover that that separation was a serious and fatal error, and that there is no need of their constructing or arranging a new Liturgy at all, because the Church from which they sprung, retained, preserved, and handed down to our times a Service which breathes the spirit of the Primitive and Apostolic Church, and is at the same time the noblest monument of the Reformation.

Art. IV.—THE UNITY OF MANKIND.

1. *The Races of Men;* a Fragment. By Robert Knox, M. D. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1850.
2. *The London Lancet.* For October, November, and December, 1855.
3. *The Westminster Review.* No. 128. April, 1856. Art. 3.

Revealed Religion cheerfully accepts the real facts of real Science. Only narrow minded theologians, or equally narrow minded infidels, can see in the apparent discrepancies which are sometimes fancied to exist between Divine Revelation and human Science any reason for discrediting either of these sources of knowledge. For every branch of human Science itself is beset with these same difficulties. Apparent inconsistencies and contradictions are all around us. These result from the finiteness of our powers, which cannot at once perceive the connecting links or the remote truths which harmonize these seemingly conflicting phenomena. All that true science demands, therefore, is a sufficient warrant for each of two apparently opposing truths. Humble because she knows no more, she is content to hold them both as truths, knowing that the reconciliation exists, although we cannot see it; and patiently and laboriously seeking for the additional knowledge which will bring that reconciliation into view. This is the spirit which is continually enlarging the domain of human knowledge, removing difficulties that seemed to be insuperable, and bringing to light the hidden things of darkness. It is true that every advance in knowledge which clears up one set of obscurities, brings into startling prominence another set in the enlarged scope of observation thus revealed,—for man is finite, and God is infinite in His own works and ways. It is thus that human knowledge is to be ever progressive, ever increasing and enlarging.

The entire scheme of redemption—which is the sum and substance of Christianity—is founded upon the postulate of the Unity of the human race, fallen in the first Adam, and restored in the Second—the Man Christ Jesus.

If the Unity of the human race is established by sufficient warrant of Divine Revelation, no facts, however seemingly inconsistent with that truth, should in the slightest degree shake

or impair the faith of a sensible man in that Revelation. For he only applies here the principle on which he is compelled to act on every other subject: that is, to hold, on sufficient authority, *apparently* inconsistent facts, knowing that the reconciliation exists, and may sometime be discovered, if such discovery be within the range of human powers.

On the special subject of our present enquiry such reasonable and philosophic modesty would seem to be imperatively demanded. For who was with his Maker when man was first ushered into being? What can human Science tell of the origin of man? How came he here, is obviously a question beyond the domain of science. She was not there when the eternal God took counsel with Himself, and said—"Let us make man in our likeness," and therefore she is silent, she can give no response, no solution to the problem of human origin. If she dared to teach at all on this subject, her only utterance would be the gross absurdity of an endless retrogression. But this she cannot teach, and therefore she utters no voice here. Awed into sublime silence by the majesty and mystery of CREATION, she devoutly hearkens to the word of the Almighty—"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He them; male and female created He them." Gen. i: 27. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts xvii: 26.

But the "science, falsely so-called" knows nothing of this philosophic modesty, or of this deep, adoring reverence. Boldly stalking "where angels fear to tread," this science, with flippant tongue proclaims, that the actual varieties of the human race shut out the possibility of a common origin of mankind. This science contends, in opposition to the only record we have, that we are compelled to allow as many distinct creations or beginnings for mankind, as there are marked and permanent varieties of race in the world.

Now, if we subject the issue thus made with Revelation to the test of a purely scientific examination—if we go upon the very ground occupied by the impugners of Revelation, and look at the question simply in its scientific aspect, as a branch of merely human knowledge, it will appear that the alleged conclusion against the unity of the human race is not by any means *ex necessitate:* that such a conclusion is not inevitable even to our seeming, as a question of pure science.

This will be doing much more than the advocate of Revelation is called on to perform. For if there was to our seeming, irreconcilable contradiction between the two facts—the Unity

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

sessed by one family and tribe is possessed by every other family and tribe. Of these same multitudes every spiritual power and capacity and affection exhibited by one family or tribe is as certainly exhibited by every other family and tribe.

Precisely the same general identity is found in the abnormal as in the normal, in the diseased as in the healthful condition of mankind. The same physical diseases afflict indifferently all men who are exposed to the causes of them. The very same unsoundness and vitiation of mind and heart are actually manifested in every nation, by every human being. Intellect, passion, moral apprehension, and religious affection, are found to be the same in kind among all men. The history of the most distant ages and nations is but a varied detail of the same general facts, of the same social phenomena.

But, how infinite in wisdom and power is the Creator of this wondrous frame of things! In the midst of this universal sameness, how infinite is the variety! Of all the seventy thousand people in the town in which we write, no two of them are so alike that they cannot be distinguished! Of all the myriads of men and women now alive upon the earth, no two of them are so alike that they cannot be distinguished! All have the same general form, the same erect attitude, the same cast of features, the same human physiognomy. But the varieties, at this moment, in this general identity, amount to eight hundred millions, that being the estimated number of human beings now on the earth.

Here is a stupendous miracle of Almighty power and wisdom constantly manifested in the eyes of all men. Is this next to infinite variety in the human race inconsistent with unity of origin? This question is answered in the negative by the experience of every family in the world. The actual concurrence of an endless variety, with unity of origin, is affirmatively proved by the history of every family in the world.

Here the impugner of Revelation interposes, and although compelled to behold the fact of innumerable varieties in the human race, concurring with known unity of origin, insists upon a distinction. Some of these varieties, he says, are so great that it is impossible to believe in a community of origin; and experience proves that these great varieties are permanent in particular races, and are not reproduced in other races. Natural causes are not adequate to the production of these great varieties.

But the lesser varieties would seem to us to be equally inconsistent with unity of origin, if we did not see the fact of such unity coexisting with these varieties every day. The force of

the objection will be removed by a consideration of certain facts connected with these phenomena.

1. The alleged greatest varieties do not consist simply of certain striking contrasts, but, as in the case of color, shade into each other by almost imperceptible degrees, from the fair Scandinavian to the darkest Negro.

2. The scale of color is found to be in a remarkably uniform proportion to the heat and dryness of the various regions of the earth. To this rule there are only a few marked exceptions.

3. All the varieties of *form*, characteristic of different races, are common, in *individual instances*, to all the races of men. You can find individual cases in every community parallel to any of these alleged characteristics of race. This fact alone destroys all the presumed necessity of referring these varieties to difference of origin; because the very same variety is thus seen to be consistent with known identity of origin.

4. It is certain that culture and other causes will produce varieties in vegetable and animal forms far greater than any existing varieties in the human race; and these varieties, when thus produced, become permanent.

5. The indefinable varieties that constitute *family likeness* are as permanent, as far as we know, as any of the alleged varieties of race. If any permanent varieties, therefore, prove plurality of origins, a distinct origin for each family is equally proved by the same reason, which would be multiplying the miracle of creation beyond all the claims of all the religions in the world. But, as we have seen, the widest distinctions of race are but extensions of the mighty mystery of wisdom and power which has ordained the transmissible varieties that constitute family likeness, and the inconceivable multitude of varieties that distinguishes all the individuals of the human race.

6. The advocates of this plurality of origin cannot agree among themselves as to what amount of difference will require the application of their principle. The old classification into five races they now contemptuously reject. Mr. Pickering, the latest original observer, says that there are eleven distinct races. He does not touch the question of origin by this classification, any more than Blumenbach did by his recognition of five races. Knox, a wild declaimer against the unity of mankind, finds several distinct races among the old inhabitants of the British isles. Agassiz tells us that men were produced at once in whole nations—each nation created for its own territory—thus far transcending in poetic license the pretty fable of the heathen Ovid, who relates how the only pair preserved from

the deluge threw stones behind them, each of which suddenly became a man or woman.

7. Many of these varieties are manifestly the result of mental and moral deterioration. Without taking generations into account, we can see the process of physical brutalization commence in the countenance and figure and carriage of persons everywhere who give themselves up to a merely brutal and animal life. We behold the converse of this in the increasing nobleness of appearance produced in the children of degradation by a right physical and moral culture. One of the most painful exhibitions we ever witnessed was the infant school in the Almshouse at Philadelphia. The stupid, animal look of those children of vice and wretchedness, just taken from the dens and cellars and gutters of the city, seemed like a mockery and a carricature of innocent and intelligent childhood. In their new and improved situation the light of intelligence and of affection will gradually begin to illumine their countenances, and the idiotic brutality of look will presently disappear. If, on the contrary, they had remained in their original degradation, and had never been allowed to mingle in a society of intelligent and educated people, that early cast of countenance would have been fixed indelibly.

Every physiologist knows that the entire human figure is modified and indefinitely changed by exercise and occupation. The blacksmith's arm and the porter's leg are familiar examples of this modification. The bony structure of the head and face is subject to these influences in a remarkable degree. And from the softness of these bones in childhood, and their minute subdivision into very small portions, the configuration of the head and face is easily modified by the circumstances of birth and education.

Whatever may be thought of the details of phrenological science, there are certain great, leading facts relied on by its advocates, which have been known and considered from the earliest times. It is certain that the anterior portion of the brain is developed in some pretty definite proportion to the intellectual capacity of the animal, or race, or individual man. When the intellectual powers have never been brought into exercise, the anterior portion of the brain will not grow to its normal and proportional size, the bones will adapt themselves to the form of the organs they are to cover, and there will be a deficiency of forehead. So, where to eat, is the great purpose of life, and yet subsistence is of difficult attainmen', all the vital energies of the system will be concentrated on this object, and there will be a protrusion of the lower part of the face—the

jaws—corresponding with the depression of the forehead, and constituting that prognathous aspect which marks the lowest forms of humanity.

Now, let the causes calculated to produce these effects be in continuous operation through a long series of successive generations, and with that cumulative force with which such causes necessarily operate upon successive generations, unless counteracted by some external force, and we shall see a sufficient physiological reason for the principal varieties of form by which the various races of men are characterized. The real wonder will be, not that the forms are so widely separated, but that the original unity has been so strikingly maintained.

The apparent identity of the human race under such various and conflicting circumstances is one of the most remarkable exemplifications of the permanency of existing forms of life and organization. The law of unity has so antagonized and counteracted the many powerful causes of change and diversity, that all men can instantly recognize, in the most cultivated and in the most degraded races of men, the common, the universal, the unchangeable lineaments of a common humanity. The actual identity is far more wonderful than the actual varieties. For it must be remembered that as some tribes, removed from the ennobling influences of true religion, have been sinking in the scale of being and of majesty of form; so, other tribes, elevated in all the faculties of their nature by the direct and indirect influences of revealed religion, have been making a progress upward, in the very opposite direction. Yet, bring the highest and the lowest of these forms together, and every one recognizes them at once as men, the possessors of a common nature, the claimants of a common humanity.

But suppose we put all these considerations entirely out of view. Suppose we allow that the varieties of the human race are so great as to be utterly unaccountable by any known physiological laws; and to be far beyond the reach of the analogies furnished by the varieties, produced by culture and other causes, in other forms of animal nature. We can afford to make these suppositions, because even then the question of the unity of the human race must be decided according to the old verdict of mankind.

Allowing that the diversities could not be produced by natural causes simply, there remain but two possible methods of accounting for them. One of these is the oft-repeated MIRACLE of a great number of independent and distinct creations of single pairs, or of whole nations of men. The other is *the miraculous production of these varieties by the sovereign will of*

the Almighty, CONCURRING, for wise purposes connected with the Providential government of the world, *with the natural causes above referred to, and adapting each separate family of mankind more perfectly to its actual position.*

Either hypothesis involves a miracle. For the impugners of Revelation, while they profess to scout at miracles, do, on this subject, multiply and exaggerate the miracle of creation beyond all the demands of religion or of philosophy. Which of these miracles is the easiest—for God does not waste even His infinite energy? Which of them is most in accordance with existing analogies—with the known laws of human propagation? Why, the latter miracle, if it must be called such, is but a slight extension to race, of the perpetually recurring *law* which preserves an endless variety between individuals and between families. Both these effects should undoubtedly be regarded as miracles in one sense—that is, as exertions of Almighty power and will. But both must alike be regarded as *simple laws of human nature*, once determined by that Almighty will; and differing in their results, not at all in kind, and but little in degree.

Which, then, of these two miracles shall we take? That which resolves itself into a law, which we know to exist, and which we see to be universally operative, producing with ceaseless energy innumerable effects at every instant of time; or the alleged multiplied miracle of distinct creations—of independent origins—of which we have no present experience?

Sound philosophy certainly requires that we should take the former alternative, even were we to leave entirely out of view the Scriptural representation of human nature. This is the plain and obvious conclusion of science and of reason.

But when we bring into the consideration of this problem the additional fact, that a record of human history, proved to be of Divine authority by a concurrence of innumerable testimonies, affirms that there has been but one creation of man; and assumes the resulting unity of the human race as the foundation of all religious truth, the problem is at once and easily solved. The *a priori* conclusion of sound philosophy is thus historically proved to be true.

When that historical evidence is thoroughly studied, its revelations are found to be perfectly coincident with the universal human consciousness—the consciousness, not of one family and tribe, but of all families and all tribes. The only record we have of the creation of man tells of but one creation. And that same record of one manhood speaks the heart language, and tells out the living consciousness of all who claim the name of men.

The one man from whom all are descended was created in the image of God, says the record. And the broken impress of that image is found alike in every representative of humanity, at whatever distance in the social scale, or in variety of form and appearance.

"In Adam," says the same Divine record, "all died." And so, universal consciousness and universal observation concur in proving the oneness, the perfect identity, of human corruption, which is the realization of that fearful death. Here again, in this very corruption of human nature, endless variety is seen to be resolvable into perfect unity. Human transgressions are as varied as human disposition and circumstance. But the corruption from which they all proceed is found to be the same everywhere and under all circumstances.

Again the Record says, "In Christ shall all be made alive," and "ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Accordingly we find that the stirring appeals and the glorious hopes of redemption find the same kindling response in the hearts and minds of all men, of all ranks, in all climes, and of every known variety of stock, caste, form and color.

The certain conclusion of the whole matter is, that the actual condition of the human race in this regard is but another illustration of the universal law of being—UNITY amidst VARIETY. God has made of one blood all the nations to dwell upon the face of the whole earth. And, for wise purposes connected with the economy of the world, the same God has ordained that infinite variety which we behold in this unity. This is the undoubted conclusion of true philosophy as well as of true religion. This is the conclusion which common sense heartily and unreservedly receives.

To this point the present article was prepared, as a sufficient expose of the scientific folly on this subject, which sets itself in opposition to the revelation of the Almighty. But while we were writing, the "science, falsely so-called," consistent only in its enmity to religion, had changed the ground of its assault upon the Unity of Mankind. Under the title of "The Philosophy of Zoology," Robert Knox, M. D., &c., commenced the publication of a series of Articles in the London Lancet, in which he bases his contradiction of the Word of God upon the so-called Transcendental Anatomy. The series, although evidently but just begun, has not been continued, up to the present writing, beyond the number for last December. We may hope that the discontinuance has been occasioned by an unwillingness on the part of the conductors of that Journal, to be used as the agents for conveying to every part of the world

such bold, disgusting, and gratuitous atheism as these papers contain. After reading these papers in a periodical so distinguished and influential, we turned to consider with more attention the previous work of the same author, "The Races of Men." We found the two productions very impartially characterized by the same recklessness, inconsistency, and self-contradiction, combined with a philosophic air, well calculated to impose upon the unreflecting. To multiply instances of his contradictions would be tedious and unprofitable. One will be sufficient, as it will let us into the heart of this new philosophy. In his book on "The Races of Men," Knox states and denies the doctrine of Hippocrates, that "external circumstances modified human structure and human character." That to the circumstances summed up in the expression, "Air, Water, and Place might be traced all differences in the form, complexion, and mental qualifications of men." "That such alterations become in time permanent, transmissible by hereditary descent." Knox says that this doctrine "is contradicted by every well ascertained physiological law, and by all authentic history." p. 65.

Most persons will be surprised after reading this to learn, that Knox in this same book, and yet more distinctly and elaborately in the London Lancet, puts forth this very doctrine, modified by the Transcendental Anatomy, as his own peculiar system.

In a writer so loose and shadowy, it is difficult to find any brief and distinct statements, but the following passages present the general view of the author: "All living matter is capable of assuming every possible viable form of existence, *that form varying merely in accordance with the nature of the media it then inhabits*—in short, with the essential conditions of its existence." p. 121. "One thing is certain; it is the unity of the human family as a group of animal life; specific; with forms still human." p. 145. "Certain varieties, then, in human form, are produced by the law of unity of the organization; for every individual living form grows up influenced, regulated by two contending principles. The law of unity of the organization, ever present, ever active, ever ready to retain the embryonic forms." "The law of individuality of species—of speculization, leading to the perfection of the individual." p. 33.

In the London Lancet, the author speaks more definitely: "The embryo of any species of any natural family contains within it, during its phases of development, all the forms or species which that natural family can assume, or has assumed in past time." "The same, I believe, holds in man; so that were all the existing species of any family to be accidentally

destroyed, saving one, in the embryos and young of that one will be found the elements of all the species ready to reappear, to repeople the waters and the earth, the forms they are to assume being dependent on, therefore determined by the existing order of things." "As of fishes, so of man: one natural family—one embryonic form, equal to the production of all species in accordance with the essential conditions of existence in time and space." "The Negro, the Saab, the Mongol, are not the descendants of each other, nor of the white races, nor *vice versa:* they are forms of development of species from individuals, each possessing within them the elementary forms of all the species of the natural family to which they belong. All that is required for their appearance on earth, is the geographical, and, above all, the geological conditions under which they can exist. When these are found, the region becomes what is called a center of creation, from which the forms spread, under the limitations which Nature prescribes to herself."

Extracts to the same effect might be multiplied indefinitely, for this is the peculiar and labored doctrine of the essays. But that doctrine is almost identical with the statements of Hippocrates, so contemptuously rejected. The principal difference will be found in the Theism of the ancient, and the Atheism of the modern philosopher. Dr. Knox assures us that the French Revolution first completely emancipated the human mind, and gave opportunity for the development of his profoundly scientific revelations. Yet these revelations, so boastfully paraded, amount to nothing more than the simple formula announced by a great mind in the very birth time of human science. Air, Water, and Place, of Hippocrates, correspond very perfectly with "the geographical and geological conditions" of Dr. Knox. One scientific formula Dr. Knox can claim as an advance upon the philosophy of his great Predecessor. "The living zoological world, as it now exists, and has existed, is a *self-created, self-creating* world." Lancet, Vol. II: p. 460. The Dr. may, if he pleases, credit this proposition to "the French Revolution—that mightiest of all human events."

Let us see another example of the way in which philosophy, when it argues against God, falls into self-contradiction. Dr. Knox, in his first book, lays down the proposition as certain, that "no new species has arisen since the historic period." p. 264. In the London Lancet, he states the like position of Cuvier, and says, "Hence the law of fixity of species was forced upon him. After the most deliberate reflection, I adhere to the same view—namely, the inconvertibility of species into each other by any physical laws now in operation." p. 274.

But in the same work he declares that "Species is the product of external circumstances, acting through millions of years." p. 391. And by the same indefinite agency of "millions of years," he attempts to make out "the highest generalization," that "life is one, not many," and that the most complex form of animal life has evolved itself from the simplest. Here is philosophy to be admired. It first establishes a proposition as the certain result of all the known facts in known time; and then infers a proposition precisely opposite as the result of the same facts in unknown and conjectural time! If there were no facts at all upon the subject, the latter proposition would be a mere conjecture, fit only for the amusement of dreaming sciolists. But when the facts are so well known as to be referred by these very persons to a law—the inconvertibility of species in known time—the assertion of the unlimited formation and transformation of species in unknown time, is not only gratuitous, is not merely a conjecture, but it is a gross insult to the human understanding. The only conclusion which these gentlemen had a right to draw from their premises is, that the law of fixity of species prevailed in the unknown past, as it has done in the known historic period. Instead of this, they depart from their premises and assure us that "millions of years" will reverse the operations of thousands of years, and will account for all the actual phenomena of existence, without having recourse to the superstition of "final causes," or of a First Cause! "The doctrine of first cause, first distinctly formuled by Socrates, afterwards by Philo-Judaus, and pushed to its utmost extent by Paley, or at least by the Dutch writer, whom he is said to have pirated, had so firmly taken possession of all minds, that the adoption of any more philosophic view, seemed, at least in England, impossible. In Germany it was otherwise." London Lancet, Vol. II, p. 388.

The so-called Transcendental Anatomy, upon which Knox so boastingly bases his system of zoology, furnishes a remarkable instance of the way in which certain persons try to *diabolize* every new discovery, or supposed discovery of science, by exclaiming, there, now, your God is demolished, your religion is absurd, it is refuted by the laws of nature.

The principle of the Transcendental Anatomy is simply this—"All animals are formed upon one great plan." Knox on the races, p. 117. "Unity of plan, Unity of design, observable, traceable, demonstrable, in all forms which live, which have lived, or which may hereafter come into being." London Lancet, Vol. II, p. 383.

What has unity of organization, unity of plan, to do with

the denial of a Creator, or of one or more creations? Unity of plan, instead of leading us to blind nature for its origin, conducts us to an all-seeing God—to the One Mind which conceived at one instant all possible relations and dependencies. Transcendental Anatomy, therefore, if true, will furnish another excellent chapter for the works on natural Theology. Dr. Knox fancies that he has abolished the superstition of a Creator when he announces—"All living matter is capable of assuming every possible viable form of existence, that form varying merely in accordance with the nature of the media it then inhabits—in short, with the essential conditions of its existence." But whence came this capacity of living matter, and the correspondence between this capacity and external circumstances? It is a law of Nature, says the Dr. That law is impressed upon the living matter and upon the external circumstances by which it is modified, and made to assume the almost infinite variety of forms that exist. Where did this law come from? Who gave it, and impressed it upon dead and living matter? The Theist gives a satisfactory and rational answer to this question. The man of pseudo-science gives no answer; but prates about nature, the eternity of matter, and the superstition of believing in a First Cause.

With the true and rational answer to this momentous question, no theories of life and organization, no systems of geology or physiology, nor any department of human science, can have anything to do, *except to lead the mind inevitably up to the question, and to the all-sufficient answer.* These theories and systems, and all human science, lie in a sphere below that question and answer. They may appear, disappear, reappear, and vary indefinitely, yet they have introduced the sublime knowledge of God which nature and Christianity teach.

Applying the Transcendental Anatomy—the unity of organization—only to the "family of man," as Dr. Knox professes to do in his last work, and we have precisely the conclusion to which we came in the previous part of this Article. The conclusion which we hold in common with Dr. Knox is, that the human family is a unit, modified into permanent varieties by a law, that law operating in combination with external circumstances, and adapting each variety of the family to those circumstances. As rational Theists we hold further, in opposition to brute Atheism, that the law, and man and its subject, and the circumstances of his being, and the adaptation of one to the other, proceed from a Being All Wise and All Powerful—the CREATOR of all.

The profoundest philosophy leads inevitably to the devout

conclusion of the Psalmist—"I will give thanks unto THEE, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: Marvelous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well. Thine eyes did see my substance yet being imperfect: and in thy book were all my members written; Which day by day were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."

On the important subject discussed in the foregoing Article, a learned friend hands us the following authorities, which we give in the form of an Appendix.—ED. CH. REVIEW.

The Unity of the Race is becoming more and more an interesting topic of inquiry, and there is an impression in the community that naturalists generally have come to a conclusion unfavorable to such unity. This impression is incorrect. Our most distinguished naturalists and ethnologists, down to the present time, either favor the unity or express themselves with great caution and modesty on the subject. I propose to collect some of their testimony for the last twenty years.

I commence with WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT, (b. 1767, d. 1836,) a man whom, it is said, every German is proud to name, as quoted by his brother in the *Kosmos*.

"The separate mythical traditions found to exist independently of one another, in different parts of the earth, appear to refute the hypothesis of an original gregarious condition of mankind, and they concur in ascribing the generations of the whole human race to the union of one pair.

"The general prevalence of this myth, has caused it to be regarded as a traditionary record transmitted from the primitive man to his descendants."

The testimony of ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT, the living Nestor of Physical Science, is found in his *Kosmos*, published in 1845.

"So long as attention was directed solely to the extremes in varieties of color and of form, and to the vividness of the first impression of the senses, the observer was naturally disposed to regard races rather as originally distinct species than as varieties. In my opinion, however, more powerful reasons can be advanced in favor of the unity of the human race.

"By maintaining the unity of the human species, we, at the same time, repel the *cheerless* assumption of superior and inferior races of men." See Sabine's *Cosmos*, I, 352, 355.

Let the reader observe the word *cheerless*, and he will perceive that Humboldt has the heart of a man.

The title of a work published by ARTHUR JAMES JOHNES, *Philological Proofs of the Original Unity and Recent Origin of the Human Race*, Lond., 1846, speaks for itself.

Dr. JAMES C. PRICHARD, (b. 1786, d. 1848,) the greatest writer who has treated of the science of ethnology, gives his last testimony in his *Report to the British Association for the Promotion of Science*, June, 1847.

"I may venture to remark, that with the increase of knowledge in every direction, we find continually less and less reason for believing that the diversified races of men are separated from each other by insurmountable barriers."

To which Dr. Prichard annexed in a note—

"It is with much gratification that I find this to be the ultimate conviction of the great author of Kosmos."

An Obituary of Dr. Prichard, by Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, read before the London Ethnological Society, Feb., 1849, contains two interesting paragraphs:

"I have understood that the young ethnologist maintained a correspondence with his father on the subject of his investigations, and that the good man not only took a lively interest in the inquiry, but expressed his desire that his son would maintain the orthodox side of the question with respect to the unity of our race. Judging from the uniform tenor of Dr. Prichard's mind, I am induced to believe that to this side his own views were always disposed to incline, although he has collected and stated the arguments on both sides with perfect fairness and impartiality.

"It may seem rather paradoxical, yet I cannot withhold the observation, that this bias is more favorable to the attainment of the true solution of the question, than the opposite tendency, and a readiness to admit independence of origin in several distinct pairs. This last assumption, by affording a ready explanation of the several varieties of form, color, and stature, must tend to damp the ardor of research; whereas the desire to discover the proofs of connection, in spite of these diversities, is like a lantern to our path in the obscurity of night; whilst the objections of opponents, whether urged or anticipated, must ever be ready to recall erring steps, where any deviation is made from the path of truth."

In the same Obituary, Dr. HODGKIN expresses his own opinion:

"Having myself paid some attention to the ethnological grouping of human skulls, I must confess that I have found very considerable difficulty in adopting points of characteristic difference, and in this very difficulty I find an argument in favor of the unity of our species, and of the differences we observe being those of variety only."

D. Ernest Diefenbach, in *Journ. Ethnol. Soc.*, Vol. I, p. 17, Lond., 1848, shows himself a follower of Humboldt:

"We may be able to collect the colors of the prism, each of them rich and beautiful, into the pure ray of light, and confirm by inductive science the *cherished* unity of mankind."

"If anything can confirm the unity of mankind, and can bring it home to the most sceptic mind, it will be, when, by a thorough study of all the languages of the globe, we can prove them to be merely dialects, and derivations, from one and the same source."

Thomas Smythe, D. D., of Charleston, S. C., in his *Unity of the Human Races*, New York, 1850:

"The unity of the races is proved from the universality, nature, and connection of languages."

Wm. J. Hamilton, D. D., of Mobile, Ala., in his *Friend of Moses*, New York, 1852, p. 482:

"Reason, tradition, and the Mosaic record do, then, all combine to assure us, all men, of all the different races now existing, have originated from one primitive pair."

Max Muller writes thus to Chevalier Bunsen, Aug. 1853:

"Physiological Ethnology has accounted for the varieties of the human race, and removed the barriers which formerly prevented us from viewing all mankind as the members of one family, the offspring of one parent."

"Such visions will float through the study of the grammarian, and in the midst of toilsome researches his heart will suddenly beat, as he feels the conviction growing upon him that men are brethren in the simplest sense of the word—the children of the same father—whatever their country, their color, their language, and their faith." See Bunsen's Christianity and Mankind, Vol. III, p. 474, 486. Lond. 1854.

Chevalier Chr. Chs. J. Bunsen, in his *Report to the British Association*, June, 1847:

"Physiological inquiry inclines, on the whole, towards the theory of the unity of the race;" and "philological inquiry tends more and more to the same result."

"A high religious faith and a low philosophy of human nature must drive a thinking and honest mind, if not into despair and madness, into comfortless, chilling indifference and stupor."

Sir B. C. Brodie, President of London Ethnological Society, in his Address before the Society, May, 1853:

"It is, however, satisfactory to find that the inquiries of the Ethnologist, so far from being opposed to, actually offer a strong confirmation

of the Mosaic records as to the origin of mankind from one parent stock, and not from different creations."

"Many facts lead us to believe in the unity of the race."

Richard Cull, Honorary Secretary of the London Ethnological Society since its first institution, assumes the unity of the race in his Annual Report to the Society of the progress of Ethnology:

"Our knowledge of human hybridism, if there be such a thing, is still more limited; and we cannot hastily assume, that what is true of the lower animals is also of man, and thus, by an assumed analogy, speak with dogmatism of the genera and species of mankind."

Dr. Robert Gordon Latham, the well known philologist, who has written *The Natural History of the Varieties of Man*, and *Man and his Migrations*, Lond. 1851, holds also to the unity of the Human Race.

Most of these authors are still living, and wrote with a knowledge of the facts of the case before them.

Art. V.—REV. DR. TURNER'S LETTER ON THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

To the Editor of the Church Review:

Rev. and Dear Sir,

It is with reluctance that I trouble you with this communication, the subject of which, however, presents, I think, a very sufficient reason for requesting its admission into your Periodical.

The last number of the Church Review contains some strictures on the edition of the Bible lately issued by the American Bible Society. They may be found on p. 422. As the Episcopal member of the Committee on Versions, under whose supervision the edition was prepared, I feel it my duty not to suffer them to pass unnoticed. It is not my intention to vindicate the right or propriety or expediency of Episcopalians uniting with other Christian bodies in associations formed for the purpose of disseminating the Sacred Scriptures, which they in common with such bodies regard as the word of God, and the rule of their faith. While many of our most honored Bishops belong to such institutions, and while we can appeal to the fact that William White, the venerated name which all sorts of Church people profess to hold in highest esteem, was the distinguished President of a General Bible Society, any such vindication would be, to say the least, a very strange work of supererogation. I say little about the charge against the Society of "consenting to take bribes from the revilers of Christ's divinity and atonement," simply because it presumes a degree of moral turpitude, to prove the existence of which, would require not merely ordinary evidence but the strongest demonstration. The writer has not stated the supposed facts on which he bases this very foul charge. Even supposing them to be just such as he presumes; supposing, too, that "the revilers" have offered the bribes; it still charges on the Society the intended and deliberate criminality of "consenting to take them." Of course I would not so degrade myself or the American Bible Society—which I regard as among the very noblest associations for good which our common country may be proud of—as to vindicate the Institution from such a charge. Rather than accuse your correspondent of so shocking an intention as his language necessarily implies, I am willing to presume that inadvertently and hastily he wrote what his cool and deliberate judgment would greatly modify, if not entirely withdraw. But the ex-

travagance of the charge against a numerous body of men of the very highest respectability for religious, literary, practical and useful character, must compel every dispassionate reader of the article to take the subsequent statements with due allowance, and that is, to say the least, very great indeed. It is reasonable to suppose *a priori* that the unchastened propensity to censure the Society which is developed in this gross attack, has had no slight influence in shaping the statements that follow. The writer does not seem to have considered that such an introduction goes very far to weaken, if not to destroy, the influence of all he says; at least with persons whose prepossessions have not placed them beyond the reach of argument.

Your contributor makes inconsistent statements. He says that "the proposed Standard is no longer the English version at all." Yet in the very next sentence he grants that "the professed improvements in the text are comparatively few, and may be regarded as slight." How is it possible to reconcile these two contradictory assertions? The text and the version are identically the same. The changes therein are "comparatively few, and may be regarded as slight," and yet they make the book "no longer the English version at all!" Truly it passes my skill in interpretation to reconcile such a glaring inconsistency as this. It is to no purpose to say what immediately follows, that "the professed improvements introduce a principle which, *if carried further*, would destroy the book as a genuine English Bible." The question is not what might be true under certain circumstances, but what *the fact is with regard to this edition*, which he affirms is "no longer the English version. Moreover, he should have told us what a genuine English Bible is, establishing at the same time the correctness of his description. *Explain terms* is a good old rule, which every writer would do well to keep in view.

As I wish the reader of these remarks to have the charges distinctly in his mind, I must here quote at large. "When a Society whose endowments were received on a compact to print and publish a recognized work, becomes a Society for criticising and reëditing and improving that work, it is our business to beware of it, and to ask the question whether such depositaries of a worldly trust, are safe guardians of the sacred oracles. I say further, that the secret managers of the Institution, whoever they may be, are very greatly to be blamed for their abuse of the confidence so blindly reposed in them. While professing to give our countrymen the English Bible, 'without note or comment,' they have, in fact, become commentators in a dangerous form, and have corrupted the work they profess to pub-

lish, by the introduction of unauthorized *headings*, of which some are grossly unevangelical, while others are virtually anti-Christian. This assertion I am prepared to sustain more fully," &c. The writer talks of sustaining his assertion *more fully*. MORE FULLY! He has not attempted to sustain it *at all*. He has made assertions, and nothing else.

He charges the Society with a breach of promise, with such a failure in the matter of a solemn contract as would stamp disgrace on merely business men who profess no religious character. He speaks of *secret* management, though everything in relation to the institution lies open to the public, and a history of the procedure in regard to the very edition so calumniated has been published to the world. Does the author know what the Society pledged itself to do? I presume not, and should be sorry to think otherwise. The first article of the Constitution which was formed in May, 1816, sufficiently speaks for itself. It is as follows:—"This Society shall be known by the name of the American Bible Society, of which the sole object shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment. The only copies in the English language to be circulated by the Society shall be of the version now in common use;" that is, what is generally known as King James' Bible. The Society does not promise to reprint any particular edition of this version, with a particular set of headings, marginal notes, references, &c. Its contract is limited to the version, in other words, to the text itself. This article of the constitution was formed at a time when numerous editions of the version were in circulation; some with various headings, various references, various punctuations and capital letters, and some with no headings or references at all. And this practice had prevailed not only in this country, but also in England. In all these respcts editions differed. No charge of aberration from authority was ever made against these or subsequent similar editions. All were accepted by the Christian community as "*the version in common use.*" This settles the principle, that headings are not of the essence of the version, and may be changed without affecting it or the original pledge of the Society. And the history of the publications of King James' version shows that this has often been done.

The writer applies the epithet *authorized* to the *headings*. There is more reason to apply it to *marginal readings and notes*, and just as much to make it comprehend *references*, *punctuation*, *capital letters*, *spelling*, &c. It is easy to speak of all these as *authorized*, but what edition of the Bible is for the Christian community the authoritative standard on these points?

The answer is, *no one*, and therefore the author's statements are simply *a begging of the question*, and of no weight at all as argument. If it should be said that a large proportion of the headings in the leading editions are in substance the same as those of the original one of 1611, and that they have become authorized by length of time, it may be replied, that a continuous repetition does not give them authority—that the best of the later editions which have been generally received in the Church of England, among which Blayney's of 1769 may be named as prominent, have altered in many cases, which proves that the respectable editors recognized no such principle of authority—and lastly, that a large proportion of the original headings are retained unaltered in the edition lately published by the Society. This edition, which the author complains of, has not altered "the genuine old English Bible," except, in the mode of spelling a few words, in the occasional use of capital letters and of the articles *a* or *an*, in the insertion of a few italics when the original contains nothing correspondent, and sometimes in the punctuation. And in every case, the committee thought that a good reason for the change could be given.

It would extend this Article to an undue length, were I to enter very much into details respecting these various particulars. But the subject demands a few words. In the spelling, the most important alterations are those of two proper names. In Rom. ix, 25, the old name *Osee* is changed into *Hosea*, and in Jude, ver. 11, *Core* into *Korah*. I was not particularly desirous of these changes, but willingly acquiesced in them, because they produce uniformity and make the words more intelligible to uninformed readers or hearers. The others are not so great as had been before introduced into all important editions, not one of which, for the last 150 years, to the best of my knowledge, follows the spelling of the original edition. The use of capitals and of punctuation necessarily involves somewhat of comment, and indeed so do also the division into chapters and verses, and even the subdividing into words, between which some early manuscripts leave no space. Yet, I suppose, that no intelligent man will question the propriety of all this, and certainly no honest one will say that such points were intended by the language of the constitution, "without note or comment." When the word *spirit* occurs, its meaning *must* be intimated, unless indeed it is always printed with a capital or always without one.* And it is impossible to punctuate such

* The use of a small letter in the word "spirits," in Rev. i, 4, has been objected to. See particularly the note in the Translation of this Book issued by the American Bible Union, 1854, p. 79. "The American Bible Society now

places as Matt. xix, 28, and Heb. x, 12, without suggesting something of an explanation. In many cases the committee would not alter the commonly received punctuation, because they did not choose to introduce, solely on their own judgment, what they nevertheless believed to be an improvement. The same remark applies to not a few marginal notes; of the latter I will refer to two instances. In Num. xxiv, 20, the text reads thus: "Amalek *was* the first of the nations." The marginal note is as follows: "Or, *the first of the nations* that warred against Israel, Ex. 17, 8." Here the words not in italics* are comment; very ancient, indeed, for it appears in the Chaldee Targum of Onkelos, but wholly unfounded. So also in Isa. xl, 9, the translation is, "O Zion—O Jerusalem that bringest good tidings." In the margin the reading is, "*O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion*, ch. 41, 27, and 52, 7;" and, immediately afterwards, "*to Jerusalem.*" The Hebrew will not bear the marginal change, and the two passages referred to are not apposite, because the form in the original is different. Yet these are left untouched, simply because they appear in the original edition of 1611, which in this respect the Committee did not feel themselves authorized to alter in accordance with their own conviction of the meaning.

I have reserved the topic of *headings* for more particular consideration, because especial importance seems to be attached to them, and they are made the subject of marked censure. "Some are grossly unevangelical, others virtually anti-Christian." Without pretending to have in memory all the headings which are peculiar to this edition, I do not hesitate to express my belief —founded upon a familiar acquaintance with many of them, and a confidence in the evangelical and Christian character of those members of the Committee who chiefly devoted themselves to

---

prints this word *spirits*, (without a capital,) as the result of the Society's application of the following rule: 'The word *Spirit* . . . everywhere is made to begin with a capital when it refers to the Spirit of God as a divine agent; but not when it denotes other spiritual beings or the spirit of man.' My belief is that the Society's interpretation of the term in the present instance is erroneous, though it agrees with Robinson's, and that it weakens and darkens the sublimest formula of benediction to be found in Scripture." Now it appears to me that the Society has avoided giving any interpretation at all. Its rule, which is a general one, does not provide for a case so peculiar as this, unless indeed its language be freely interpreted. If a capital letter had been employed, it might have afforded plausible ground for the objection, that seven Spirits of God are recognized as divine agents. The use of a small letter does not imply a denial that the whole phrase conveys the idea of the Holy Spirit, but only that the word "*spirits*" alone does not. And that is true. Let it be noted that the original edition of 1611 prints this word with a small s. The Society's standard does but follow it.

* In the edition of 1611 they are in italics as well as the words that precede them.

this department—that this charge cannot be sustained. It is hardly necessary to suggest to any intelligent person that an omission of some evangelical and Christian sentiment is no proof of a want of evangelism, much less of opposition to what is Christian. If so, the charge would apply to the Book of Esther and the Epistle of St. James. And yet, I doubt whether the writer has anything else to found his very grave accusation on than barely such omissions, and the substitution of other headings in their place.* Instead of "becoming commentators in a dangerous form," as he says, or indeed in any form whatever, the leading principle which governed the Committee in the article of headings was to avoid, so far as was possible, all comment. With this view they frequently altered headings, with the sentiments of which they entirely accorded, because they were decided commentary, and substituted others, which no candid man can so represent, for this plain reason, that they are taken from the very words of the text itself. In many cases, the headings in the original edition of 1611 seem to have been made on the same principle. Two or three illustrations will be sufficient—"Gen. iii, 14, The serpent is cursed; 15, The promised seed. Num. xxiv, 15, He prophesieth of the star of Jacob. 2 Sam. vii, 12, He promiseth him benefittes and blessings in his seede. Isa. xi, 1, The peaceable kingdom of the Branch out of the root of Jesse." In other cases they were evidently prepared with a view to exposition. Thus in Isa. xl, 1–10: "The promulgation of the Gospel, the preaching of John the Baptist, the preaching of the Apostles." To the same purpose, Blayney. The heading in the lately published edition is as follows: "God's command to comfort his people. 3, An exhortation to prepare the way of the Lord. 9, And to proclaim the glad tidings of his coming." This is drawn from the text itself, and it allows—what is necessary to a fair interpretation of the portion—a reference to the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity and their re-settlement in their own land, and also the return of mankind to God by means of the Gospel of His Son. The old heading ignores the former view entirely, though it is as much the prophet's meaning as the latter. Ab uno disce omnia. On the same principle, the word *Christ* in the Psalms and Prophets is altered into *Messiah*, and *Church*, as occasion required, into *the people of God*, or *Zion*, or *Israel*. In the Song of Solomon, the words *bridegroom*

* After preparing this reply, I saw a note from the author of the Article in the Church Review, written in defense of his charge, which proves the correctness of what is above stated.

and *bride* are introduced, being the terms employed by the author himself. No intelligent reader needs to be informed that *Messiah* in Hebrew and *Christ* in Greek mean the same thing, namely, *Anointed*, and consequently either equally expresses the royal, prophetic and priestly character of our Lord. It has been objected to the introduction of the Hebrew term in the Old Testament that it accommodates to Jewish expression. This is worthy of note, as it shows how utterly devoid of argument the objection is, and for the same reason it is unworthy of any attempt at confutation. The other terms are frequently used in the Bible to denote God's Church. The words selected as prominent in the headings of Solomon's Song, are the most endearing descriptions of Christ and his Church to be found within the compass of Scripture. And yet it has been said that the adoption of them in the Standard Edition shows that the book was regarded as a mere epithalamium. Such illogical conclusions are quite in character with the animus which allows a writer to stigmatize the edition as a CORRUPT AND DANGEROUS COMMENTARY, UNEVANGELICAL AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN!

For further information in regard to the character of the headings in the American Bible Society's standard,* compared with those in some former editions, I will now submit to the reader a few instances, leaving him to form his own judgment on the point of preference. I confine the comparison to the original edition of 1611, to Blayney's of 1769, and to the Edinburg of 1845, which was used in its collation. It will be seen that the idea of any set of headings having been authorized so as to preclude alteration, never seems to have been thought of. Gen. iii. Here the editions of 1611 and 1856 agree. Blayney's differs somewhat: 6, Man's fall. 14, The serpent is cursed, and his overthrow by the seed of the woman foretold. 22, Their expulsion out of Paradise. The Edinburg is as follows: 6, Man's fall. 14, The serpent is cursed; his overthrow by the woman's seed. 16, Mankind; punishment; and loss of Paradise.

ix. 1611: God Blesseth Noah. 4, Blood and murder are forbidden. 18, Noah replenisheth the world. 21, Is drunken and mocked of his sonne. 25, Curseth Canaan. 26, Blesseth Shem. 27, Prayeth for Japheth. Blayney: God blesseth Noah, granting him animal food, but forbidding the eating of blood, and murder. 18, The earth is re-peopled from Noah. 20, He planteth a vineyard, is drunken, and mocked by Canaan, whom he curseth, and blesseth his other sons. The Edinburg: God

* Imperial quarto of 1856.

blesseth Noah. 4, Blood and murder are forbidden. 8, God's covenant. 13, Signified by the rainbow. 23, Noah is drunken, and mocked by Ham. 26, He blesseth. 29, He dieth. 1856: God blesseth Noah. 4, Murder and the eating of blood are forbidden. 8, God's covenant with Noah. 13, The rainbow a token thereof. 18, The sons of Noah. 20, He planteth a vineyard, is drunken and mocked by Ham. 25, He curseth Canaan. 26, Blesseth Shem and Japheth. 29, And dieth.

xxii. 1611: Abraham is tempted to offer Isaac. 13, Isaac is exchanged with a ramme. Blayney: 11, The angel stayeth him from slaying his son, in whose stead he offereth a ram. The Edinburg: Abraham offering Isaac, 11, is stayed by an Angel. 20, The generation of Nahor with Rebekeh. 1856: Abraham commanded to offer up Isaac. 3, His faith and obedience. 11, The Angel of the Lord stayeth him. 13, A ram is sacrificed instead of Isaac. 14, The place is called Jehovah-jireh. 15, Abraham is blessed again. 20, The children of Nahor. The reader will not fail to observe that this is the only one of the four editions which gives a full view of the chapter.

Deut. xviii, 15. 1611: Christ the prophet is to be heard. Blayney: A prophet to arise like unto Moses, who must be hearkened unto. 1856: A prophet is promised to Israel.

Job xix, 23. 1611: He believeth the resurrection. Blayney and the Edinburg: He professeth his belief of a future resurrection. 1856: He is confident that God will yet vindicate his cause. In this case the original heading might well have been retained, at least in substance. It not only expresses a very old opinion, but one which I believe gives a correct view of the text, such as I stated 29 years ago in a note in Jahn's Introduction, pp. 469, 470. The heading in the late edition, however, does not deny this sense, as Job's future resurrection would effectually vindicate his cause. But neither does it affirm it, as do the two preceding editions. It leaves the reader free to form his own judgment, which, whether it be in favor of or against the opinion, may find distinguished names both of ancient and modern times to defend it. It is worthy of note that while the English copies commence the word *Redeemer* in verse 25 with a small letter, the American employs a capital.

Psalms xvi, xxii, xl, lxix. In all these Psalms and also in others, the editions of 1611 and Blayney represent David as the speaker. David complaineth—Hee prayeth—Hee praiseth God:—Obedience is the best sacrifice—The sense of David's evils, &c. Thus all ultimate reference to Christ is excluded, although this is inconsistent with numerous quotations in the New Testament. The edition of 1856 employs the word

Psalmist, which is applicable to the speaker, and does not identify the subject of the Psalms with the writer. Thus it leaves the reader free to understand them of the Messiah.

Song of Solomon: The most considerable changes have been made in the headings of the chapters of this book. In the older editions these are direct and positive commentary, affixing interpretations which limit the meaning to Christ and the Church. For example: v, 9. A description of Christ by his graces; vi. 4. Christ sheweth the graces of the Church; vii, 1. A further description of the Church her graces; viii, 8, The calling of the Gentiles. Blayney repeats these headings. The edition of of 1856 avoids all attempt to explain, by selecting its headings from the text itself. One example must suffice: viii. The delight of the bride and her beloved in each other. 6, Love strong as death. 8, The bride's desire in behalf of her sister. 14, She longeth for the coming of her beloved.

From the prophet Isaiah one or two passages have already been given. It may be well, however, to add a few others. vii, 1611: 7, Ahaz hath for a signe Christ promised. Blayney: Christ is promised for a sign. 1856: 10, Ahaz refuseth to ask a sign. 14, The Lord promiseth Immanuel. liii. 1611: The prophet complaining of incredulitie, excuseth the scandall of the crosse. 4, By the benefitte of his passion. 10, And the good successe thereof. (The reader will do well to consider what is the meaning of this.) Blayney altered the heading thus: The prophet complaining of want of faith, describeth the humiliation of Christ; 4, His suffering; 10, And the good success thereof. This is certainly an improvement. The Edinburg coincides with Blayney as far as the word *faith*, adding: and then excuseth the scandal of the cross, 4, by the suffering of Christ. The edition of 1856 has as follows: The Messiah despised and rejected. 4, His sufferings in our behalf. 7, His meekness, humiliation, and death. 10, The benefits of His passion.

lv. 1611: The prophet with the promises of Christ calleth to faith, 6, and to repentance. 8, The happy successe of them that believe. Blayney: The prophet with the free offers of grace through Christ, exhorteth to faith, 6, and to repentance. 8, The happy state of believers. The Edinburg follows the edition of 1611 in the first sentence, and Blayney in the second. 1856: A gracious invitation to accept God's abundant mercy in the Messiah. 10, God's word shall prosper.

lxi. 1611: The office of Christ. 4, The forwardnesse, 7, and blessings of the faithfull. Blayney on ver. 1, the same. 4, The restoration and blessedness of the Church. The Edinburg is

the same as Blayney with the omission of *and blessedness*. 1856: The office of the Messiah. 4, The glorious results of his coming.

lxiii. 1611: 1, Christ showeth who he is, 2, what his victory over his enemies, 7, and what his mercy toward his Church. 10, In his just wrath he remembereth his free mercy. Blayney: Christ showeth his power to save, and his vengeance upon his enemies. 7, A thankful commemoration of God's old loving kindnesses to his people. The Edinburg omits Blayney's second clause, and substitutes *remembrance* for *commemoration*. 1856: The Messiah's triumph over the enemies of Zion. 7, A song of thanksgiving to God for his goodness to Israel. 15, The prayer of his people in their affliction.

lxvi. 1611: 19, The Gentiles shall have an holy Church, 24, and see the damnation of the wicked. Blayney: 18, The gathering of the believing Jews and Gentiles into one Church, where they shall together worship God, and see the damnation of the wicked. Instead of the last clause the Edinburg has: God's severe judgments on the wicked. 1856: 19, The message of salvation to be sent to all nations, and the fruits thereof. 24, The fearful end of transgressors.

Jeremiah. 1611: xxiii. 5, Christ shall rule and save them. Blayney: Christ the righteous branch is promised. 1856: 5, Predictions concerning the Messiah.

In Daniel, and also generally in the minor Prophets the edition of 1611 attempts no exposition, not even in Dan. ix, 20, which is the same as that of 1856. Blayney introduces there these words: Gabriel informeth him of the seventy weeks, and of the time and death of the Messiah, and of the succeeding troubles. In ii, 14, the original edition has: Daniel findeth the dream. Blayney, who is followed in the late edition, improves: The dream is revealed to him. To the same purpose the Edinburg.

I have selected the above headings because they relate to important portions of the Old Testament. They are, as I believe, a fair specimen, and give the reader an opportunity to judge for himself, whether the abuse contained in the statements of the Church Review has any reasonable ground. Do these and other similar alterations justify the charge of offering a lure to *the revilers of Christ's divinity and atonement*, of *vitiating the English Bible*, of *abusing confidence*, of *corrupting the work*, of *introducing* GROSSLY *unevangelical and virtually anti-Christian headings?* The accuser, in the fullness of his anti-American Bible Society bias, has not allowed himself to think the matter over with due calmness and deliberation, and inconsiderately, as I would fain hope, has published to the world what is in itself untrue.

The "Report of the History and recent collation of the English version of the Bible," which was "presented by the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May 1, 1851," and was afterwards published, contains a collection of headings, an examination of which may enable the reader to judge of the expediency of making some changes. See pp. 27, 28. I quote one or two, and add also a few more of portions which are not of especial importance, merely to show more fully how the most respectable editions vary from each other, and from the original of 1611.

1 Sam. xvi. 1611: Samuel sent by God, under pretense of a sacrifice, cometh to Bethlehem. Blayney: Samuel at God's direction goeth to Bethlehem under pretense of a sacrifice. The Edinburg follows that of 1611. 1856: Samuel sent to Bethlehem to anoint one of the sons of Jesse. A thoughtful reader will ask himself whether it is allowable to represent the head of the Prophets as going to do one thing under pretense of another; and this by the command of God?

Ps. lxxii. 1611: David praying for Solomon, sheweth the goodnesse and glory of his, in type, and in trueth, of Christes kingdome. Blayney: David praying for Solomon showeth the happiness, justice, and glory, of his reign, and of Christ's kingdom under that type. Edinburg: David showeth the glory of Solomon's kingdom in type, and of Christ's in truth. 1856: The Psalmist praying for the King, foretelleth his prosperous and glorious reign.

cxlix. 1611: The Prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the church, 5, and for that power which hee hath given to the Church to rule the consciences of men. Such a heading may have been agreeable to persons high in authority in the time of the first of the Stuarts, but subsequently it was found expedient to alter it. Blayney and the Edinburg read after *given*, to his saints. 1856: The Psalmist exhorteth to praise God for his love to Zion, 5, and for that power which he hath given to the saints.

[Eccles. xii. 1611: The Creator is to be remembered in due time. 8, The Preacher's care to edifie. 13, The feare of God is the chiefe antidote of vanitie. Blayney: The first two sentences as in 1611; afterwards thus: 13, The general conclusion, that man's chief concern is to fear God and obey his laws. Edinburg: The Creator to be remembered in the days of youth, and must not be deferred. 13, The fear of God the chief concern of man. 1856: The young exhorted to remem-

ber their Creator. 10, The Preacher's care to edify. 13, The whole duty of man.]

Isa. xlv, 20. 1611: Hee convinceth the idoles of vanitie, by his saving power. Blayney: Idols convinced of vanity. The Edinburg omits any heading of the verse. 1856: The vanity of idols. li. 1611: An exhortation after the patterne of Abraham, to trust in Christ; 3, by reason of his comfortable promises; 4, of his righteous salvation; 7, and man's mortalitie; 9, Christ by his sanctified arme, defendeth his from the feare of man; 19, He bewaileth the afflictions of Jerusalem; 21, and promiseth deliverance. (An extraordinary heading, truly!) Blayney: The righteous are exhorted by the example of Abraham to trust in God, who will comfort his Church; 4, The certainty of his salvation; 7, The reproach of men should not be feared by the righteous; 9, A call upon God's arm to exert itself as of old in redeeming His Church; 12, The vanity of fearing man, and distrusting his Maker's power; 17, The Prophet bewaileth the afflictions of Jerusalem; 21, and promiseth deliverance. Edinburg: The righteous exhorted, after the pattern of Abraham, to trust in Christ; 4, The certainty of his salvation; 17, The Prophet bewaileth the afflictions of Jerusalem, &c. 1856: Comfort promised to Zion; 4, God's salvation is near; 7, The destruction of Zion's enemies foretold; 9, The people of God pray for his aid as of old; 12, His promise to them; 17, The afflictions of Jerusalem bewailed; 21, and her deliverance promised.

Lam. iii. 1611: The faithful bewaile their calamities; 22, By the mercies of God they nourish their hope; 37, They acknowledge God's justice; 55, They pray for deliverance; 64, and vengeance on their enemies. Blayney: The Prophet bewaileth his own calamities; 22, He acknowledgeth God's mercies and truth to be a proper ground of patient hope; 37, He maketh humble confession of the sins which had drawn down God's severe judgments; 55, He prayeth to be avenged of his enemies. Edinburg: The Prophet bewaileth his own calamities; 37, His humble confession of sins; 55, and prayer for deliverance. 1856: The first part agrees with the Edinburg; 21, He acknowledgeth the mercies of God; 37, His humble confession of sin; 55, He prayeth for deliverance: 64, and for recompense upon his enemies.

Dan. xi. 1611: 5, Leagues and conflicts betweene the kings of the South and of the North; 30, The invasion and tyrannie of the Romanes. Blayney: 21, The exploits of one of the latter princes; 30, who, being checked on his progress by the

ships of Chittim, shall turn his fury against the holy land; 36, An impious tyranny set up; 40, Events that shall take place in the latter times. The Edinburg follows 1611. 1856: 21, The rise of a vile person to power; 30, His impious conduct; 40, His fall.

Jonah i, 4. 1611: He is bewrayed by a tempest. Blayney: He is overtaken by a tempest and discovered. Edinburg: The ship is overtaken by a tempest. 1856: He is overtaken by a tempest.

Every reader who compares the headings of these different editions with each other, and with that of 1611, must admit the following results:

1. So far from uniformly following the original edition, Blayney and the Edinburg not only vary from it, but evidently intended to correct and improve it. Consequently they did not regard its headings as settled by authority, and unalterable, except by the same or equivalent authority.

2. They often vary from each other; and this proves that they recognized the right of altering what had been previously in use. Therefore, *in this respect*, they did not regard any edition as a standard not to be varied from.

3. Some of the older headings were of such a kind as to require alteration, and those substituted in the edition of 1856, are manifest improvements.

The marginal readings appended to the text in the original edition, are retained in that of 1856. See those of Num. xxiv, 20, and Isa. xl, 9, before stated. A few others have been added; as, for example, "Gr. *The passover*," in Acts xii, 4, where the text has "Easter."

I have said nothing respecting the references to other texts. In the early editions, these are very few. Later ones have multiplied them, beyond all reasonable bounds, adding in some cases, to those of its original edition, more than a hundred on a single chapter. I do not allude merely to Canne's celebrated reference Bible, but to editions, some of Oxford, generally received by the Church of England. Many, on the other hand, omit them all. Of course, they were never regarded as authoritative.

Had the author of the Article in the Church Review stated in the most decided terms his opinion of the inexpediency, and even impropriety of introducing alterations from any supposed authorized standard, I would not have troubled him or the Church with the publication of my own contrary opinion, since I freely grant the right of private judgment on all such matters, and the public expression of it. But when he makes the

[illegible] of such alterations on occasion of exposing to [illegible] a most respectable body of men, a solemn sense of duty [illegible] me to stand and to resist the charge. This I have now done. When I consider how carefully those abused [illegible] were prepared, how they [illegible] avoid obeying what is [illegible] how [illegible] they appear to have been made with a single eye to truth, I must say, that I regard such [illegible] that attacks as those which have now been considered, as [illegible] of [illegible]. It seems to be a case in which the divine precept applies, "Let us weep, and not we." Eph. iv. 26.

SAMUEL H. VENN.

[illegible] Vicar, Huddersfield, Yorkshire.

Art. VI.—THE LATE GENERAL CONVENTION.

Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, 1856. *Together with the Constitution and Canons.*

Unusual pains were taken by the Secular and Religious press to spread before the Church full and accurate reports of the proceedings and debates of the late General Convention. All who desired information in regard to what was said and done, enjoyed the amplest means for securing it. This fact renders unnecessary, at this time and in these pages, any formal recapitulation or elaborate resumé of the proceedings. In what we have to say, we shall go upon the presumption that our readers are duly informed as to the details. Our object, then, is not to narrate or to compile, but so to study the more important topics and forms of legislation, as to catch and put on record, for the inspection of after years, a just impression of the prevailing temper and dominant purpose of the Triennial General Convention of 1856. For history tells us that such bodies survive longer in their power for good or evil, through the tone and spirit of their conferences, discussions, and enactments, than through any special results which they may originate by the processes of formal legislation.

It will not, we think, be deemed an extravagant pretension, if we claim for a Quarterly some peculiar advantages in an attempt of this character. While conceding to our Weeklies all those qualities which make them effective and influential—such as enterprise, promptness, and a certain quick and nimble facility in dealing with affairs as they rise—qualities finding expression in paragraphs and leaders, written *currente calamo*, and embodying, sometimes, of necessity, judgments and criticisms essentially extemporaneous; yet we may claim for an organ like this, the very great advantage of securing for the subjects it treats a graver handling, more mature convictions, and, on the whole, conclusions more truthful and impartial. This advantage may not always appear in these pages, but it enters largely into the public estimate of our resources and responsibilities.

The General Convention is composed of two Houses—the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The House of Bishops consists of all the Bishops, Diocesan and

Missionary. Its sessions are strictly private, allowing the presence neither of reporters nor spectators. The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies consists of four clergymen and four laymen, chosen by each Diocese; numbering, all told, about two hundred and forty members. The sessions of this House, in token of its more popular character, are public. The course of legislation resembles that pursued in our Federal Congress. Both Houses must consent in order that any act may become a law; hence, each has an absolute veto upon the other. Whenever demanded by the deputies of any one Diocese, the vote on any question pending must be taken by orders; and to secure an effective majority, both orders must concur. The lay element, therefore, is practically just as potent as the clerical. Many analogies might be pointed out between this Body and the National Congress—so many, indeed, as to lead some to suppose that our spiritual fathers modeled, so far as practicable, the one after the other. It is well known that some of the guiding, controlling intellects in the formation of the one acted as advisers, at least, in the formation of the other. But to whatever extent, be it more or less, it was consciously attempted to conform the Supreme Legislative Body of this Communion to the Federal Legislature; there was one illustrious and memorable assembly which its framers had largely in their minds. We refer to the first Christian Council ever held—the Council of Jerusalem, over which the Apostle James presided—whose members, as Scripture declares, consisted of Apostles, Elders, and Brethren. Our fathers accordingly established a Council composed of Bishops, Presbyters, and Laymen.

It has been sometimes objected to the Episcopal Church that its government and discipline are too centralizing in their tendencies, that Bishops wield too much power, that their sphere of influence is dangerously large, and therefore that the very genius of the Church estranges it from the popular voice. The Protestant Episcopal Church is representative—republican; but not democratic. It is so in the sense that our civil organization is. Politically we are a republic, not a democracy. There are two ends which all proper Church government must keep in view: viz, efficiency of collective action and protection of the individual—in other words—thorough organization and security of private liberty. Now the first can be had only by a certain amount of centralization; the second can be had only by a corresponding amount of diffused power. The Church has happily provided for the accomplishment of both these ends by centralizing in the prerogatives of Bishops, and by diffusing in the franchises of the laity. In doing so, she has had a wise

reference in all cases to the quality and degree of power so conferred. Without dwelling upon this point, we may safely assert that notwithstanding the authority vested in Bishops and Presbyters, no communion in the land has given the laity so much substantial and practical power as our own. For ample proof of the fact we need not go beyond the constitution of this—the highest Council of the Church. The power thus granted to the laity is, in all its bearings, so influential as to demand the fullest guarantees that it will be safely exercised. The last and surest of these has, at length, been provided by an amendment to the Constitution enacted by the late General Convention, which requires every Lay delegate to the Convention to be a communicant, and not merely, as heretofore, a baptized member of the Church. This provision, so just in itself and so effectually protective of the Church against intrusions into her Councils of enemies under the guise of friends, will quiet the apprehensions of many of our brethren of the Mother Church, who have often expressed a well-founded surprise that we should grant to the Laity so much legislative power, without furnishing any adequate safeguards against its abuse by indifferentists and unbelievers.

The powers of the General Convention may be briefly defined. They are simply those which, by common consent, it is supposed can be more advantageously exercised by such a central body than by the several Dioceses. It has hitherto been the rule to interfere as little as possible with matters that could be better cared for by the several Diocesan Conventions; and to look to the General Convention only for such legislation as the whole Church alone was competent to enact and enforce. Thus each Diocese has its own local missions, its own provisions for Christian education, its own mode of regulating the affairs of Parishes, its own Annual Conventions; while to the General Triennial Council belongs the care of Foreign and Domestic Missions, of the Prayer-Book, as containing the Church's devotional system; and, briefly, of all the essentials and most of the accidents of doctrine, discipline, and worship.

Up to a certain point there is considerable similarity between General and Diocesan rights, powers, and functions in the Church, and Federal and State-rights and powers in our political system. But, after all, it is only a partial likeness—one which, when introduced as an argument for or against proposed changes in our Constitution, is productive of serious fallacies. For, in the formation of our Ecclesiastical system and of the Constitution which defines its powers, there was no such process as that witnessed in the formation of our national union. There was no covenanted cession of rights, no formal transfer

of power, no surrender of local sovereignty and independence by one party to the other. The Protestant Episcopal Church, therefore, is to be regarded not as made up of confederated Dioceses, each in itself originally separate and independent, but as a branch of the Church Catholic, having its existence in the body of its members and performing its functions of administration and government cotemporaneously through Diocesan, and General.

As to the dignity, importance, and influence of the General Convention, it is hardly proper to pass them without a word. We have no fear that they will be overestimated. Our fears lie in the other way. This Body appears too much like a machine of convenience, its modes of procedure are too familiar to those who are actively living and immediate issues, and it is too much identified with the errors and infirmities necessarily inherent in the conduct of its varied business, as well as to the realm of conflicting plans and opinions, to be at all liable to the charge of undue reverence or extravagant admiration. We are apt to forget, while thinking of these things, the mighty interests it handles and the solemn questions it decides. We are prone to overlook its representative character in the present, and its moulding power over the future. While criticising this or that measure to which we have given, pleased or displeased with this or that of its deliberations, we fail to see how it periodically reflects the conflicting sentiments of the Church; and how it marks the steps backwards or forwards of the whole body.

The importance and dignity of this supreme body, the diversity of opinion as to the component elements whence they proceed. Some may [illegible] as well as manifested capacities for [illegible] as the gradual elaborator of a system [illegible] to spread over this continent. [illegible] impressed by the diversified talent, the [illegible] grave, the calm, conservative temperament which usually characterizes [illegible] may be more profoundly impressed with the influential constituencies it represents [illegible] every department of thought [illegible] Society and the State, in [illegible] out of all proportion to their [illegible] we are disposed to rest its claims [illegible] chiefly on the fact that it

is not only performing the responsible functions conferred by the Church in her best periods upon her national and provincial Councils; not only doing the work done by the synods of Rome, Carthage, and Antioch in the third century, or by those of Arles, Saragossa, and Milan in the fourth, or by those of Orleans and Toledo in the fifth; but doing the same work, discharging substantially the same duties, ministering to the same glorious ends, for a people and in a land and age like ours; all whose characteristics, whether of the brain, the heart, or the arm, are projected on a scale of grandeur unknown to any other period of the world's story. The work, in itself, is one of awful magnitude; but it fairly oppresses the judgment and the conscience when we reflect that it must be done among and for such huge masses of accountable life as are now leaving the old centers of civilization and seeking new homes and building new empires between these two oceans. Races, not individuals, are in motion; states, not villages and cities, are struggling to the birth. The most solemn and precious of the traditions of Christian humanity, are in the midst of an exodus from worn-out populations and decaying social fabrics into a land broad enough for the play of the world's forces, and a nation whose heart is young, whose sinews are fresh, and whose plans and hopes are even more magnificent than its capabilities of achievement are powerful and diversified.

But if this aspect of the case reveals broad views of the dignity and importance of our General Convention, there is still another fraught with a revelation yet more impressive and momentous. All these races that meet and commingle here—each bringing with it some homebred weakness or corruption, each defective in the training that qualifies for the safe exercise of political rights, each craving more or less exemption from salutary restraints; and each moreover grasping with covetous hand that lowest good of thinking natures—wealth which soonest breeds excess and pride; all these must be so fused into one as to draw their moral being from the same general sources, and to submit their wills to the same social bonds. Now it is well known that the religious element is at once the deepest and most energetic element in national life. It has more to do than any other with the formation of national character. Beyond any other it enfolds the germ of a nation's future. In the work just spoken of it must act a more prominent part than it has ever done before. But this religious element is a variable force; the quality and direction of its influence depending greatly upon the form it assumes, the channels through which it operates, and the historical associations with

which it is identified. As experience shows it may lean toward superstition or rationalism, toward despotism or individualism. So far as it does either it must become the corrupter rather than the purifier of the sources of public life, and sap rather than brace the sanctions of national conscience. Hence it becomes a matter of the gravest import what type of Christianity shall supply to this Republic the needed religious element.

Now the Christian influence at work among us is divisible into three kinds—ultra-Protestantism, or the sect spirit, Tridentine Popery and primitive Christianity—the last having for its doctrinal symbol the Nicene Creed, and for its worship and discipline those maintained by our branch of the Church Catholic. As for the first, we consider it demonstrably certain that it acts as a disintegrator of national life, and a slow solvent of all definite and positive theological truth. As for the second, it has been too often proved to require fresh evidence here that it is little better, viewed as an organized system, than a bastard imitation—a cunning counterfeit of the Gospel of Christ—and as such by all its instincts, incurably hostile to the elastic temper and thoughtful liberty of a free people. To surrender, therefore, the public conscience to the guardianship of either of these, would be to surrender the nation's hope of permanent greatness. To the third and last, then, the field belongs, however feebly it may now assert its claim or exhibit its capacity to occupy it. To this the nation must look for the religion which shall consolidate, harmonize, and sanctify the contradictory elements out of which its character must be built. In this view, what must be the significance and importance of the highest legislative body of a Church possessed of such capacities for national influence, and held to such tremendous responsibilities! We confess that no words seem to us adequate to express them, save those which a lower range of thought would [illegible] exaggerated and absurd.

We [illegible] from the national aspects of the General Convention to the national spirit which characterized its proceedings as easy and natural. If we except its religious tone and [illegible] the very fact, indeed, that it was an ecclesiastical assembly [illegible] contributed so much to render its deliberations [illegible] as this spirit of thorough nationality. [illegible] and nearly every territory were represented. And, [illegible] was appealed to, to determine the seats to be [illegible] delegations, it turned out that they [illegible] way to confirm by visible relationship this [illegible] of the body. New Hampshire and Texas, [illegible] and Alabama, Connecticut and Maryland, Wis-

consin and North Carolina, Rhode Island and Tennessee, Michigan and Missouri, Vermont and Indiana, Georgia and California, sat side by side, and often voted side by side upon the more important questions of the session. All were profoundly impressed with the conviction that it was not a Northern or a Southern, an Eastern or a Western Church assembled there; but an American Church, still mighty in its power to pacify sectional strife and conserve the blessings of civil and fraternal union. It was felt that as a bond of such union no fibre in it had been jarred or loosened by the wild waves of agitation rolling without. No man there but shuddered at the thought of a rupture either in civil or religious ties. No man but went home with a new sense of the value of a united Church and a united Country, and with a firmer resolve to labor for their perpetuation.

As for the Church, she was sent to minister in all latitudes and to all peoples. To her *all are one in Christ Jesus*, and therefore her message is for the bond as well as the free, for masters and servants, for white and black, for "all sorts and conditions of men." To all these she has ministered, and to all these, if true to her mission, she must continue to minister. To-day she preaches Christ and His Gospel amid the hills of New England and on the prairies of the west; on the shores of the two great oceans and on the savannahs of the sunny south. Without suspicion and without prejudice she utters in the regions of slave as well as free labor her voice of instruction, consolation, and hope, she tells all of sin and the judgment, she points all to Him who was lifted up on Calvary for the healing of the nations, and proclaims trumpet-tongued the freedom wherewith Christ makes free. And never was the resolution stronger than now among her clergy and laity to keep her in a position to render effective this most catholic and blessed function.

As might be expected, a body over whom the broad ties of country were so influential would not be prone to serious differences in the minor matters which might come before them. This brings us to note the next feature of the Convention, as characteristic of its moral temper: viz, the calm, cheerful, conciliatory, and yet earnest spirit which marked the discussions, as well as the actual legislation of the Session. There were no foregone conclusions, no obstinate resistances, no partisan pressure of side issues. Whatever was proposed was finally settled —or at least was meant to be—on its own merits, with an intelligent and prayerful, though as we must think, occasionally mistaken reference to the Church's future interests. Through-

out the session of the House of Bishops not a party vote occurred; while in the other House, the only case which can possibly be regarded as an exception to the same statement, was so mixed up with considerations of supposed courtesy and expediency, as well nigh to eliminate those differences of theological sentiment which usually originate and determine party action. At any rate, the majority, in the vote alluded to, loudly and positively disclaim that they acted from party motives—a disclaimer which, in our opinion, should preserve the record of the Lower House as unblemished in this respect as that of the Upper.

And yet this happy state of things was not due to any unusual uniformity of opinion. All shades and schools of theological thought allowed within the Church were strongly and numerously represented. There were diversities of opinion, but no organized antagonism of action. Opposing measures were introduced; but none were aimed at the supposed peculiarities of party. Men were grouped, for the time, neither as High nor Low Churchmen; but as conservatives and progressives, as opponents or advocates of specific changes in the Church's working system. Never, we venture to say, in the history of the Church was there in one of her great councils a more striking exemplification of the noble maxim, "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, and in all things charity."

The business of the Convention ranged itself mainly under three heads: viz, Missions, Worship, and Discipline. We shall review it in the order indicated by these heads. It was regretted by many, and should be by all, that the Missions of the Church did not occupy a larger proportion of the time of the Convention. Still, we are not aware that any leading interest in this department was neglected. Such is the established plan for conducting our Missionary system, that a very considerable share of the business belonging to it, is transacted by what is known as the Board of Missions, which meets annually. The Board held several spirited meetings for revising and improving the Church's work at home and abroad, and great good was done by the various addresses and discussions. Yet it would have been well had the Convention itself given more attention to this most important interest. Its plans, its labors, its wants, its discouragements and successes, demanded more of serious and careful consideration.

Without question, the Church's first duty is to publish the Word and grace of God. Its very organization, to be a living one, must be a missionary one. It cannot pause in this work at any specified limits—no shores or boundaries hedge it in.

Its field is the world; and the health, the vitality, the inward power and heavenly aspiration of the Church depend on the earnestness and vigor with which it strives to occupy that field. Its own life grows strong and pure and deep according as it yearns to manifest itself. Its own future grows bright only as it reflects the light cast along its pathway to the midst of nations yet lying in darkness. These are truths which reason, history, and the Word of God alike declare to be imperative in their demands and universal in their application. They have their being in and their power from the Church's everlasting commission. Therefore while we are disposed to make the most of what was done to meet such a duty, we cannot but regret that it was so little.

It has long been felt that the Board of Missions was not of sufficient numerical size to represent adequately all parts of the Church. To mend this fault the number of members was more than doubled, so that now, the Board will have besides the Bishops and life members, two clergymen and two laymen from each diocese, chosen from the various sections with reference to their supposed zeal in the cause, and their capacity to help it. It is hoped, by thus enlarging the Board and taking in a new set of minds and hearts, that a fresh impulse will be given to its work. Time only can tell whether this hope will be realized.

The department of Foreign Missions was regarded as, on the whole, in a promising condition, and it was resolved to commit the Church to increased labors among the pagan millions of Asia and Africa. It was also earnestly recommended to re-establish the Mission in the Ottoman Empire. The recent changes in that region, arising out of the agitations and wars in the East, inspire the hope that vast good may now be done there by well directed missionary efforts. The amount contributed by the Church for Foreign Missions during the year from October to October was $75,000. In Africa, China, and Greece there are now in the service 20 missionaries, 20 assistants, 12 native teachers, and 1413 scholars in the several schools. These brief statements show what, as a Church, we are doing *to preach the Gospel among all nations.* The figures are small, very small; and the most that can be said of them is that they give assurance of a good beginning. It admonishes us of the vastness of the work lying ahead. It is only as a stray sheaf from an ungathered harvest, or as the small spring flowing through the fissured rock and over a surface which one day must become the bed of an ocean.

In the department of Domestic Missions the contributions during the year reached nearly $50,000. The number of Missionary stations reported is 144; the number of missionaries, 90. These

are scattered over the new States and Territories of the country —apparently a large number, and yet in view of the demands upon the Church, a mere handful.

By the nearly unanimous action of the House of Bishops, Nebraska and Kansas, hitherto under the charge of the Missionary Bishop of the Northwest, were erected into a separate jurisdiction, and a Missionary Bishop nominated to take immediate charge of it. This was justly regarded as one of the important acts of the Session, and what was remarkable, the House of Bishops, in response to the request of the new Board of Missions, decided with entire unanimity on the course to be pursued and the man to be sent. There was much in the present, but still more in the prospective needs of those Territories to make the case urgent. A noble opportunity was afforded to carry the Church into a new field in the integrity of her organization, and, for once, to send forward the Episcopate as the pioneer and practical center of Missionary activity. Altogether, when first proposed, it seemed to be a measure against which no serious objection could be started; but in favor of which all shades of opinion and classes of Churchmen would cordially concur. Grievous and bitter, therefore, was the disappointment that so judicious and timely a measure failed of confirmation by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. By a small majority of the Clergy, the Laity going strongly the other way, it was decided to be inexpedient, in view of existing circumstances. And it aggravates the case not a little, to know that even this small majority was secured by a piece of parliamentary management commendable only in the strifes of Congressional legislation. Many worthy and influential presbyters exhibited in their opposition, so palpable and surprising an inconsistency with their theological antecedents and long standing professions, as to admit of explanation, only on the ground that they acted with an imperfect knowledge of facts, and with an undue regard for considerations of a strictly extraneous and accidental character. We need not speak of our own regrets—nay, our grief and chagrin—at the turn which this matter took at the time, and at the shape in which it now stands. To do so, were only to reiterate the voice of the whole Church from one extremity to the other. Nothing gave so much moral force to the General Convention of 1853 as the sending forth of the Missionary Bishops of California and Oregon. Nearly everything else then done has been comparatively forgotten. This act, meanwhile, towers along the memory of the Church. Its significance deepens and widens as those Pacific empires rise along the shores of that silent sea. Would that the Convention of 1856 had put a like seal of im-

mortality upon its labors, and taken hold of the grateful recollections of another generation by sending out into those vast territories, with a unanimous sanction, a Chief Pastor able and fit to cope with the emergencies incident to new States and spreading races.

We come now to what was done in regard to Worship —or that which embodies the Worship of the Church— the Book of Common Prayer. It was supposed by many, that the various topics growing out of this matter would chiefly engross the time and attention of the Convention; whereas, save in the House of Bishops it engrossed very little of either. In order to appreciate what was done, it will be necessary to revert to the spirit and design of discussions previous to the meeting of the Convention. It will be remembered that for the past few years our newspapers and periodicals have largely discussed certain proposed changes—not, as some seem to think, in the Liturgy itself, but in the use of the Liturgy. For some time back, there has been a portion of the Clergy, all the while growing in numbers and influence, who have expressed the conviction that our Ritual was too unbending, that it required for its own highest efficiency more flexibility in the rubrics and a more careful adaptation to the wants of the Church in its missionary and aggressive character. They have urged the expediency of granting a larger discretion to the Clergy in so adapting it to times and occasions. They have claimed that in some cases the Services were too long, and that, though edifying in settled and educated congregations, they were too complicated and wearisome for parishes newly gathered and altogether untrained. They have urged the propriety of revising the Calendar of Lessons with a view of improving the selections for particular seasons; also the propriety of revising the collection of Hymns, so that some now in use might be abandoned, and others of greater merit introduced. They have asked, moreover, for a larger number of Special Prayers to be used on occasions for which there is now no suitable provision.

Such, in substance, were the changes—if changes they can be called—asked for by a numerous and respectable portion of the Clergy. And to show that they were neither disloyal to the Liturgy in its present form, nor desirous of needless innovations, nor wanting in sound and discriminating conservatism, they appealed to the facts that the Prayer Book had already undergone revision and emendation four times since the Reformation, and that the last two hundred years had been signalized by wonderful modifications of all the relations of mankind; facts very

properly justifying the inquiry, at least, whether, after the lapse of such a period and the occurrence of such changes in the world's thought, temper, and manners, some corresponding changes were not required in a System of Worship whose glory should consist not only in being Scriptural in tone, and primitive in structure, but also Catholic in its reach over the human heart. In addition to these subjects of petition, some extreme men advocated the expediency of extending Episcopal Orders on certain conditions to the ministers of other Communions. But as this comes under the head of discipline it will not be farther alluded to here.

These views were brought before the House of Bishops in the shape of a Memorial praying them, as the Fathers of the Church and as her highest and wisest Counselors, to take such action as they deemed best on the topics thus introduced to their notice. This Memorial was presented at the Convention of 1853. The House of Bishops appointed five of their number to sit, during the three years ensuing, as a special Commission to consider the wishes of the petitioners. This Commission sent out circulars through the Church inviting replies from the leading Clergy to the questions therein contained. The result was, that when the five Bishops met, preparatory to shaping their report, they had before them, in addition to their own views and labors, a vast amount of carefully formed opinions from all parts of the Church. Their Report to the House of Bishops in the last Convention was the joint product of all this collected learning and mature experience. Acting upon this Report, the House of Bishops, after long and animated discussion, resolved that no legislation was necessary to meet the wants of the Memorialists; that the structure of the Prayer Book need not be touched in order to secure all the adaptation asked for; that all needful liberty in administering the Services might be obtained by a more just and liberal interpretation of the Rubrics; and that it was part of the prerogative of every Bishop to provide for his diocese such special Prayers and Services as its emergencies might require. They accordingly adopted the following Preamble and Resolutions, as expressive of their opinions on the matters referred to them:

"Whereas, the order of worship, as prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer or as settled by usage, has been framed with special reference to established Parish Churches, and to a population already incorporated with the Church;

"And whereas our actual work is, or should be, among many not yet connected with our Congregations, or where there are no established Parishes, or where said Parishes are yet in their infancy;

"And whereas there are, or may be, in different Dioceses, peculiar emergencies,

arising out of the character and condition of certain portions of the population, which demand some special services;

"And *whereas* it is desirable that the use of the Book of Common Prayer, as the vehicle of the Church's devotions, should be such as to cultivate an enlightened love for the Liturgy, and enable the clergy and people to make their labors for Christ more effective; therefore,

"*Resolved*, as the opinion of the House of Bishops,

"I. That the Order for Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion Office being originally separate services, may be used separately, under the advice of the Bishop of the Diocese.

"II. That on extraordinary occasions or at special services, not otherwise provided for, Ministers may, at their discretion, use such parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and such Lessons from Holy Scripture as shall in their judgment tend most to edification.

"III. That the Bishops of the several Dioceses may provide such special services, as, in their judgment, shall be required by the peculiar spiritual necessities of any class or portion of the population within said Dioceses; provided that such services shall not take the place of those prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer in Congregations capable of its use."

By thus giving to the Church a mere declaration of opinion, they avoided the necessity of making any new laws, or altering any old ones, or even touching the letter of a rubric. And thus, too, the whole subject was not more adroitly than wisely kept out of the Lower House. If a law had been made, or a Canon altered, or a rubric modified, it could have been done only by the joint action of the two Houses. But as only an opinion was given, no such joint action was needed. And yet that opinion of the Bishops, as was ably and eloquently urged by distinguished members of the Lower House, will have the moral force of law, while the absence of formal enactment and the vigilant watchfulness of conservative men will save the Church from dangerous innovations. It will be seen at once that those Resolutions cover a great deal of ground, and open the way for some changes in the mode of conducting Public Service not hitherto sanctioned by common usage.

Most gratifying proof was given by all of an immovable attachment to the Prayer Book, and of a profound desire that it might be handed on unchanged in any important particular. Some, however, thought it entirely consistent with these feelings, and even demanded by a wholesome and intelligent conservatism, to advocate certain minor changes which affected neither the principle nor the form of the Liturgy, but only advanced its efficiency. Others, and they apparently a very large majority of the Clergy and Laity, declared the *use* of the Prayer Book, in one sense, to be the Prayer Book. Change the use, and in effect the thing used is changed. Let the mode of conducting Public Service be one way in one Diocese, and another way in another Diocese, and the real uni-

...ship would practically be destroyed. It was ... opposition to any changes whatever, that ... likely to result from them would be more than ... by the moral damage arising from such an ... It was urged, too, that this Book of de... the best elements of our past life as a Church, ... to us as a sacred deposit, that it had be... heart of the Church an object of rever... its merits had already drawn multitudes to ... that its permanence and uniformity enter essentially ... and that with the best intentions to im... would create more evils than they would ... Such were the two grades of Conservatism drawn ... of the Memorial question. They are pre... the genius of our Church naturally pro... respectively, the coördinate necessity of ... stability.

... Clergy who asked for action on the afore... prayed the Bishops to take some steps ... absolute or partial, of the divisions which ... distract the great body of those who call ... in other words, to do something to ... of Christendom. They were moved to ask ... have long pained the conscience and sensi... of Christ; facts patent to the world; ... more than any other cause to retard the ... its tongue in heathen lands, and ... over unbelief and wickedness ... referred to are simply those which go ... Sectarian organizations and Sectarian ...—the history of Christians professing ... Faith, and the same Baptism, yet bat... under names of human device, un... In view of the prayer sent up to ... basis of Christendom the House ... the following declaration, and ...

... readiness of union amongst Chris... willingness to communicate or receive ... and in order to conference if ... occur: this House will appoint ... five Bishops, as an organ of commu... with such Christian bodies or individu... be entitled the Commission on Church ...

"That, in making the above appointment, it is distinctly understood that the Commission is clothed with no authority to mature plans of unity with other Christian bodies, or to propound expositions of doctrine or discipline."

Who can but rejoice that such a step has been taken by this Church, that such a testimony has gone forth from her on this all-important subject. It is right that she should speak first and strongest—she, who had a being and a history before these Sects were born—she, out of whom many of them went forth taking of her riches but mutilating her Faith and Order—she, who to-day holds fast and cherishes with sacred love the same Creed, the same Order, the same Sacraments which constituted the essential bonds of unity when the Church walked as one body under the guidance of those whom Apostles' hands had touched, and a martyr's death had consecrated. It may be that her overtures will be scouted. It may be that the bitter sect spirit of the time will revile and sneer at them. Still it will now go on record that this Branch of the Church has, in this regard, done her duty, and put herself into an attitude friendly to the revival of Christian concord and Ecclesiastical Unity. Our own opinion is that this well intended and praiseworthy effort will, for the present, be utterly fruitless. There are many preliminaries, as serious as they are difficult, to be settled before anything can be done with the main question. Humanly speaking, it seems idle to undertake to gather into one fold the various divisions of Christians—each strong in numbers, intelligence, and peculiar attachments, so long as there exists such a radical disagreement as to the very nature of Unity—its terms—its notes—nay, its very desirableness, if to be had only under a visible form. A large part of Protestant Christians, (though we are glad to see a movement in a different direction, and that too in influential quarters,) profess to find no warrant in Scripture for Visible Unity. They regard history as testifying against both its necessity and expediency. They reprobate it as a cause and an effect of a tendency to despotic centralization. They condemn it as oppressive to the free energies of spiritual life. They even profess to see in the sect principle a prolific source of blessing and religious power. With such views abroad, all proposals for Unity, as we understand it, can be of no avail. Doctrinal differences, conflicting notions of expediency, and hereditary alienations must first be reconciled. Men must be convinced of the desirableness of a given result before they can be induced to coöperate in producing it. Still we hope for the best even amid, what we feel to be, overwhelming discouragements.

There is only one rule for Churches and individuals in the work assigned them, and that is to do their duty and leave the consequences to God. As an act of faith—as an expression of desire for the recovery of a lost pearl of great price—as a step taken by a growing and active branch of the Church Catholic toward peace and order in God's Kingdom, we cannot—the world at large cannot—but regard the establishment, at this time, of a special Commission on Unity as clothed with profound significance.

We cannot leave this division of our subject without a few words on what the "Memorial" movement has accomplished. It is certainly extraordinary that so brief an agitation on such matters should have been so speedily crowned with even partial success. The fact that it has been, shows that the Church in her thinking and acting adopts the rapid processes now common to all other departments of life. The "Memorial" has done more than now appears on the surface. The least of its influence is to be found in the formal and specific action which it secured from the House of Bishops. Chiefly occupied with the work of the Church and the best methods to do it; conspicuously practical and with a decided bent toward broader plans of action and nobler schemes of Christian charity, it has nevertheless made itself felt in the grave province of theological thought. By introducing fresh subjects of inquiry, and giving a new turn to discussion it has furnished a happy substitute for the protracted and acrimonious controversies of rival schools in dogmatic theology, who for many years monopolized the attention of the Church. It has led to truer conceptions of the nature, offices, and relations of Liturgical Worship; and to a more liberal and discriminating estimate of the Church's discretionary power over all Ritual arrangements. It has secured, moreover, a better understanding of what is *mutable* and what is *immutable* in the Catholic System,—of what times and manners may change, and of what must stand fast amid the changing of times and manners—a sort of knowledge essential to the Church in an age of quick and facile adaptations, an age which measures the value and force of every institution by its power to project itself into the world's thought, society, and enterprise. We say, therefore, that this movement before it closes will vindicate for itself a distinguished place in the history of our Church during this generation. Its originators and advocates may have erred in some things and failed utterly in others; they may have proposed some impracticable measures; but they have not failed to make their mark.

We pass now to the subject of Discipline—which, in the

shape of new modes of trial for accused Bishops and Presbyters and increased facilities for the administration of Ecclesiastical justice, occupied more of the time of the House than any other class of subjects. Indeed, the attention given it was out of all proportion to its relative importance. This fact gave to the whole Body the appearance of having come together from all quarters of the country to legislate for the detection and trial of unworthy officers of the Church. The subject was introduced at the very beginning of the Session; and once fairly before the two Houses, there was no alternative but to dispose of it. Discipline viewed in this aspect is always an unpleasant thing. It reminds us that even the Church of God must sometimes be purged, and that bad men now and then creep into her Councils and defile her high places. Discipline is a necessity. There must be a judicial system for bringing offenders to justice and exposing official delinquencies. One or two cases within the past few years had served to bring the subject prominently before the Church and also to show that its present system contained many serious defects. At the Convention of 1853, a special Committee was appointed to consider the whole matter and report to the Convention of 1856. Their Report was able and learned, showing a thorough grasp of the principles of Canon Law and a profound experience in the details of Ecclesiastical Courts. This Report proposed to the Convention a uniform system of trial for all the Orders in the Ministry, to operate throughout the Church, irrespective of Diocesan limits. This plan encountered serious objections. Among other things, it was urged that it took away from the Dioceses a right which they had always exercised, and usually with wisdom and energy—the right, namely, to discipline their own Presbyters and Deacons. While the question was pending a stranger would have supposed that the old Political contest between Federal consolidation and State Rights—a contest which has given to the world the choicest eloquence and the ripest wisdom of American statesmanship—was duly domiciled in the Church. After a protracted discussion, carried on mainly by the legal talent of the House, it was determined to confine the scheme to Bishops—leaving the other Orders to the care of their respective Dioceses.

Into this scheme was incorporated a new and valuable feature—styled a Board of Inquiry. It is the duty of this Board to hear all accusations and complaints and to decide whether they afford ground for trial. Its functions are not unlike those of a Grand Jury in our Civil Courts. The peculiar advantages of the system now adopted are that it is conformed to the prin-

The General Theological Seminary received more than its usual share of attention. The discussions called out by its present embarrassments and its doubtful future, were so plain and pointed as to forbid the possibility of mistake as to the views and wishes of the Church at large. It was evident that a very great majority would hail with pleasure the day which should consummate its transfer to the Diocese of New York. Few regarded it as any longer a General Institution except in name, and nearly all deemed it impracticable to attempt to make it anything else. The proxy system of voting was again enacted, probably only to be again rejected by the Board of Trustees. Much good advice came from various sources, but that it will be immediately heeded is too much to expect.

There was one concomitant of the General Convention which we should be glad to notice more at length. We refer to the Meetings and proceedings of the several Voluntary Societies connected with and doing much of the work of the Church. If we are to judge by the efforts made in its behalf or by the array of eminent and zealous friends it called out, none was so conspicuous as the Sunday School Union and Church Book Society. The prompt and generous manner in which some fourteen thousand dollars was pledged from various Dioceses to extricate it from its heavy financial difficulties was a noble and just tribute to the value of the Institution; and ought to be a strong guarantee for its more prudent and effective management hereafter.

It is the habit of many to expect too much from the mere work of legislation. They regard the prosperity and growth of the Church as largely involved in what is done in such Conventional bodies. They look for increased vigor and activity in the Church's appropriate tasks from the repeal of this or that law, provision, or rubric. They depend vastly on the making or the modifying of Canons to adapt the Church to the wants of the age and the emergencies of our spreading empire. They look to Conventions to set forward the Church some signs on the zodiac of progress. Such persons are in error; and as they expect too much, cannot but be disappointed. We would not underrate the work of such an august assembly as the General Convention. We are sure that its beneficent energies have never been fully developed. But, after all, such bodies when best conducted deal with effects, rather than causes, with machinery rather than power. They represent the sentiment of the Church; but do not create it. They toil on the outside. They plough, harrow, and fence—but they sow little. They have little command over the forces which create the harvest and

pour fertility along the soil. Not unto them belong the sunshine, and the rain, and the free wind of God's Kingdom. These lie near to each one of us that truly loves

> "The Church our blest Redeemer saved
> With his own precious blood."

These belong to the sphere of the indvidual heart—to the sphere where companies of Christians toil on within the bounds of parishes to do their Lord's work. The life of the Church is the gift of God through His Son Jesus—reproduced in the lives of her members. Some delude themselves with the thought that the Church adds to her real power as a spiritual kingdom by adding to her wealth and social strength. Mere riches, mere refinement, mere worldly strength are only glittering spangles upon her seamless robe. She may be great and victorious without them. She may be mean and vanquished with them. Let us remember that if sloth, parsimony, and selfishness prevail among our people; and low, perfunctory views of the ministry among our Clergy,—then a moral disease is in our loins and about our heart which no legislative enactments, no canons, no toning up or toning down of rubrics, no alterations or abbreviations of the Prayer Book can cure. The only effective medicine is in a heartier embrace of the truth and a readier following of the example of our ascended Lord. It is to be found in life, not law; in activity in every department of duty, not in Conventions, Commissions, and Conferences. It comes of prayer, and faith, and love issuing in *work*.

Art. VII.—FREE SEATS.

Our friend of Pews, who took the field once more in the October number of the *Review*, in reply to our advocacy of Free Seats in July, complains that our "blows, however hearty and vigorous in themselves, are feeble in effect, because badly aimed." We shall try to come a little nearer to the mark this time.

Our ground, in July, was clearly and definitely mapped out, and formed one consistent whole. We undertook to investigate whether of the two systems was to be preferred,—*Free Seats?* —*or Pews?* We began, therefore, by disentangling the discussion from its several side issues,—as to having "a *part* of the seats free," as to "large plate collections," and as to "courtesy;" showing that these, being points *common to both*, must be omitted from a consideration of the *comparative* claims of each, as rivals of each other. In this we acted on a simple mathematical principle, the correctness of which no one who has ever studied algebra as far as equations of the first degree, can question for a moment.

We then proceeded to lay down the *definition* of the two systems, in clear and precise terms. The testimony of History was examined, and found to be in favor of *Free Seats*, as the plan upon which the Church had gained her first growth and strength, and which had been her main weapon of conquest in mediæval and modern times also, even down to the middle of this nineteenth century. We looked then to the history of Pews, and followed out *their* working, showing that they lead to the gradual starving and deadening of the best life of the Church, the diverting her streams into strange pastures, and the making barren the garden of the Lord.

We next examined the excuses given for the Pew-system;—that it is "convenient," and that "it keeps families together," and found no substance in them. We showed that the soul of the Pew-system consisted in its *exclusiveness*,—the power to keep others out—and that this was the *quid pro quo* in the *bargain* by which the use of a pew was bought for so much a year. We proved that it set up a wrong standard of Christian liberality,—one which went far to neutralize the solemn warnings and exhortations of Holy Scripture in the Offertory. And finally, that the general result of the system in *supporting the*

Church in this country, was such that from one end of the land to the other, there was one continuous cry about the *starvation of the clergy*.

We gave a number of facts, from existing Free Church enterprises, showing that the principle could and would succeed, even on the low estimate of returns in dollars and cents,—an estimate, however, the justice of which we denied. We then examined the essence of the principles on both sides, according to Holy Scripture. We demonstrated that the support of the Church ought to come, not from bargain and sale, settled before the preacher can begin to preach; but from the fountains of faith and love in the breasts of true believers. And we found that Pew-rents, being the proceeds of mere bargain and sale according to a worldly standard, could not be rightfully regarded as the offerings of faith and love. We showed, moreover, that *growth* was the first and greatest law of the Church's practical life. She *must* go on conquering and to conquer, until the knowledge of the Lord covereth the earth as the waters cover the sea. We appealed to that which is now an admitted axiom on all sides, that the true life of the Church is in her *Missionary work*. For the success of this Missionary work, we proved the Free Seat plan to be absolutely indispensable. And we closed by an appeal, based upon the position of the Church in this country,—everywhere a little flock in comparison of those who yet remain to be gathered in; and yet called to greater efforts than ever before, by the fact that God is preparing the masses all around her to enter her doors, if she will but open and let them in.

Now it will be seen at once, that our main object in the above was to separate, as clearly as possible, two contradictory principles. In order, therefore, to conduct the discussion clearly and intelligently, we distinguished the operations of the two, as they are found mingled in our common working system, giving to each the credit which belonged to the *principle* involved. The summing up of this, we embodied in the *definition* of the two, clearly and categorically laying down the points in which the two meet and contradict one another. We would suggest to our friend, that until that definition is demonstrated to be incorrect, nothing is done. We here repeat it:—

The Free Church plan offers the preaching of the Gospel *free to all*. It asks no one to contribute for the "support of the Church," except such as have first heard and received the Gospel. It asks them to give *then*, only from their *Faith* in God, their *hope* of Heaven, and their *love* both toward the Lord Jesus who hath given unto them salvation, and toward their brethren who are one with them in Him. And the standard of "how much" each one shall give, is no

other than that which Holy Scripture has set forth,—"according as *he is able*." In other words, the *free hearing* of the Gospel is a condition *precedent* to the duty of "*supporting the Church*;" and the *measure of that duty is God's Word*.

The Pew-system, on the other hand, does not offer the Gospel free to any; but furnishes it only to those who have paid for the privilege. It asks a certain rent for the "support of the Church," and asks it, not from Christian but from commercial considerations, the seat being worth just as much "rent" to the Church, whether its occupant love God or not. The standard "how much" each shall pay, is regulated solely by the prominence, convenience for seeing and hearing, and general "eligibility," of the pew, having nothing whatever to do with the "ability" of the giver. In other words, the *paying* for the "*support* of the Church," is a condition *precedent*, without which no man can expect to *hear the preaching of the Gospel*; and the measure of that duty is regulated by *the world*.

This definition of the terms employed, is the kernel of this whole discussion. Our friend of the October Number is skillful enough to know the importance of definitions; that they are in themselves more than half the battle; and that if our definition of the Pew-system, (as reduced to those principles which alone distinguish it from the other,) could be proved incorrect, the whole edifice of our argument would tumble to the ground. Knowing, then, the importance of this definition, how has he treated it? Has he demonstrated it to be erroneous? No. Has he then attacked it? No. Has he so much as alluded to it in any way? No. He has indeed remarked slightingly upon one introductory process, indirectly trying to make it appear that what is a difference of *principle*, is only a question of *degree*. And in this attempt, he makes use of a couple of illustrations, from which one might infer,—if it were worth while,—that in his opinion the proportion of free pews to rented, ought to be no greater than the relative bulk of pepper to that of the soup it flavors, or rather, for minuteness, like "the small fraction of a grain of prussic acid," which is in some cases used as a medicine, but a larger dose of which would be fatal. This proportion is, indeed, very near that in which some pewed Churches, that we wot of, have "a part of their seats free." But, in reply to that definition which contains the very *jugulum causae*, our friend very prudently says—absolutely nothing.

Nay, more, our historical sketch both of Free Seats and Pews, (except so far as concerns the present state of things among us now,) is left wholly uncontradicted by him. No reply whatever is given to our analysis of the essence of the Pew-system, showing that it reverses the proper relation between Faith and Works, that it consists in the purchasing of a right to *keep others out* of the pew thus rented or bought, and is thereby directly antagonistical to *growth*. Not a syllable is offered in opposition to the principle that growth is the first great practical law

of *life* to the Church, to which all things else must be made to yield. The generally miserable support of the clergy on the Pew-system is acknowledged instead of being denied. Nor is any disproof given of our position that we are now called to make every possible exertion to secure that great growth for which Providence has so wonderfully prepared the ground on every side of us. Indeed it is on these, which formed the fundamental framework of our Article, that our friend alludes, when he actually calls them "a series of propositions which *nobody has ever dreamed of disputing.*" Certainly he has not disputed them.

One might well ask, then, Where is the use of attempting a reply? To an ordinary mind it would seem as if, with the citadel and all the outer ramparts left untouched, there was really nothing to hope from further attack. But not so our friend. He thinks that all these things may be just as true as we assert them to be, and yet "leave the question in dispute just as it was!" We are, therefore, reluctantly compelled to the weariness of following him in his endeavor to make something out of nothing. We shall find that effort naturally betraying him into a variety of contradictions, confusions, irrelevancies: and, finally, the complete concession of all that we have contended for.

The contradictions, indeed, are too numerous for us to point them all out. Our friend begins, for instance, by saying that the true point of discussion "is not whether the Free Church system is not useful for certain purposes, nor whether it does not embody and represent true and important principles which have been too much overlooked, nor whether it is not, in particular cases, preferable to other systems and the true remedy of their evils, but whether it is entitled to take upon itself *jure divino* airs, or talk in a strain of special catholicity, and on one account or another claim exclusive possession of the Church as the ordinary and permanent rule of support. Such pretensions," he adds, "we believe to be groundless and ridiculous." As to "the ordinary and permanent rule of support," he will find it laid down in our *Definition* as being, on the Free Church plan, according to *the ability of the giver*. Will he deny that this is the rule which alone can rightfully claim exclusive possession of the Church? Or will he contend that an equal right belongs to the rule of "eligibility" as laid down in the definition of the Pew-system, the measure of duty being fixed by *the world*?

As to Catholicity, we made no particular flourish with that word; but if we had, our friend himself gives us sufficient au-

thority. He denounces the pretension to Catholicity, on one page, as "groundless and ridiculous;" and on another, as the the "merest nonsense." And yet elsewhere he asserts positively, that "the spiritual equality of men in the Church of God, and the right of the poor and mean to equal privileges in His House with the rich and great, *is* a *Catholic principle.*" And on the next page, he goes still further: "The truth is, there is nothing Catholic in the matter *but* the *principle* that the Church is to be furnished with the means of supporting her Clergy, and carrying on her benevolent operations, by the *free gifts of her* members." We ask no stronger declaration of Catholicity than this. And it was hardly worth while for our friend to deny this *Catholicity* so roundly at the beginning of his Article, when he so emphatically adopts it himself before he gets through. And this, too, he assures us, is the *main point* in the discussion!

But he demurs to the idea that this "free-will support" exists any more truly on the Free-Church plan, than the other. And he proves it in a curious way. He says that "there is nowhere else in the Church, where niggardliness and parsimony can skulk so securely as in a Free Church." That is to say, that on the Pew-system, by the pressure of commercial, or social, or family considerations, niggardliness and parsimony are not allowed to "skulk." They can be *forced* to pay something, whether they will or no. And that, of course, proves that Pew-rents are as wholly "*free*-will offerings" as anything given in a Free Church! The crowning contradiction to the voluntary virtue of Pew-rents, however, will be found on another page, where our friend claims peremptorily that, so far from being any such thing as free gifts, they are only an ordinary *debt.* They are, he tells us, no part of a man's alms, any more than "his butcher's bill or the bill for his children's schooling." A very pretty specimen of those *free-gifts*, which he tells us, *are Catholic* in *principle!* But more of this anon.

In connection with this question of Catholicity, we are sorry to see that, while handsomely proving the very matter which he set out to refute, our friend has thought it necessary to mask his retreat by a scattering shot at architecture, communion vessels, ecclesiastical tailors, and "going to Rome;" all of which, he admits, have nothing to do with the question; and in regard to which he says, "we intend no ungenerous insinuations against the Protestantism of the Free Church cause,"—thus disclaiming the only interpretation of which his gratuitous denunciation seems to be capable. But it is according to a very safe rule of controversy:—"When you have nothing to reply to what your opponent has said, fall-to lustily on something that

he has *not* said. It not only sounds decisive and triumphant, but it leaves the *impression* that your opponent *has* said it, and that you have demolished him." It is in accordance with the same useful rule, we suppose, that several pages are devoted to the refutation of certain interpretations of texts of Scripture which we never made, and in regard to which, we are admitted by him to have been "discreet." It helps, however, to fill up.

As to the alleged separation of families, we are glad that our friend in last admits reluctantly, that it "is comparatively a light matter." This has been made so much of by the advocates of Pews, that we are happy to find *one* of them thus candid in acknowledging the truth. He says, indeed, that if, in practice, families are not separated, it is all the same as "saying that a Free Church will soon be a Free Church only in name." It is well enough for those who disapprove a system, to insist that some obnoxious feature is essential to it,—a feature which is unknown to its friends, and which they have always disclaimed, both in theory and practice. Those who have not tried the Free Church plan, know what it requires so much better than those who have! A similar point is that of "self-support," which is insisted upon as if it were a vital part of the system. Nothing will be found concerning it in the *Definition*, any more than about "separation of families." All that the Free Church system asserts, is that it claims support on the *right* principles, rather than on the *wrong*. We have *faith* that God's way of providing for His Church is better than that invented by the world. We know that if Christians give "according to their ability," the treasury will abound far beyond the utmost wealth of the Pew-system. We know that the results, even as now visible, are a great improvement over the past. But we do not glory in the name of "self-support," as we are supposed to do. Many, and indeed the larger number, of Free Church enterprises have been started in localities where few if any become members on reaching the very poor. And they do well if they succeed in supporting their own parish: nor are they to be much blamed if they do not raise quite all that is needed for that purpose. These churches *win souls*: which is the first matter to be attended to. The other will take care of itself in God's own way.

This unwillingness to trust to *Faith* as a principle of action, is indeed painfully apparent in the argument of our friend. Instead of looking mainly to the growth of the Church, the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, the subject uppermost in his mind is, *the support of the Clergy*. "The whole tendency

of this Free Church doctrine," he says, "is to render the *support of the Clergy precarious and unsteady.*" We beg leave to remind him, that the Free Church doctrine is, that every member of the Church should give "according to his ability;" and the whole tendency of *that* doctrine, we take it, is to render the support of the clergy more secure than under any other system. This is not its main object, however. God's whole mode of Providential government is, to bestow secondary blessings *indirectly*. If we seek first for our own personal happiness, we fail to find it. If we seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, all other things are added unto us. So if we look mainly to the support of the clergy, we shall fail even in that. But if we throw ourselves with our whole soul into the work of carrying on the kingdom of Christ, in the manner which He hath ordained, He will add unto us far more abundantly than we can provide for ourselves.

The want of this spirit of *Faith* lies also at the root of another error of our friend. Our Scriptural argument as to the proper motive for good works and free-will offerings has been altogether thrown away on him. He seems to regard such motives as very good things to preach about, but ridicules the notion of acting on them. He appears to have started with the idea that the Church is only a kind of a lecture-room, where everybody is expected to pay for the seat he occupies, and for nothing else. The collecting of alms at the Offertory is, to him, only "calling on the worshiper to pay for his seat on the spot," notwithstanding "all the fine things we have heard about alms and offerings." What can we do with a reasoner so utterly commercial in his fundamental conceptions of things pertaining to the kingdom of Heaven? Talk to him about the love of God in the soul, kindling it with burning zeal and the spirit of self-sacrifice, making it yearn to do something to show forth gratitude for the great gift of salvation: and our friend replies, "All those are very fine things to talk about; but, after all, *you know* you only want a man to pay for the bench-room he has been occupying while you have been preaching." We do not wonder that such an one is an advocate for the Pew-system.

There is no part of his Article in which he is more characteristic, than in his remarks about alms and offerings, and the mode in which they are to be distinguished from Pew-rents and the support of the clergy. Our readers may remember his original claim that Pew-rents should be considered offerings, and that when the treasurer of the parish had collected them, he might very well bring them to Church on Sunday morning, lay them on the alms-basin, have them offered reverently on the altar,

and get the minister to say the prayer for the Church militant over them. That process, he contended, would make them as completely free-will offerings as anything given on the Free Church system. Now, however, "a change comes o'er the spirit of his dream." This way of supporting the clergy turns out to have not an atom of charity, alms, or offerings in it. Hear him:—

"It remained for modern times to find out that a pastor's compensation is a charity, and that giving to one's self is doing an alms, if it is only put into a plate and set by priestly hands on an altar,—a form of almsgiving very likely to be popular, but better fitted to quiet consciences that ought not to be easy, than to produce a full treasury for the relief of God's poor and the enlargement of His kingdom. The blurring of a most vital and important moral distinction in this way is one of the prime vices of the system,—this leading a man to think that he is meeting the call of Christian benevolence, when he is simply paying a debt, and making that provision for his household, without which he has denied the Faith, and is worse than an infidel—by simply calling it an offering. The payment of money for the support of the Gospel for one's own good and the benefit of his household, is no more a part of his alms than his butcher's bill, or the bill for his children's schooling. There is as much benevolence in eating a beef-steak or putting on an *extra* garment in cold weather. That it thus confuses the idea of alms, puts the support of the clergy and of the local institutions of the Church on a false basis, and misleads people in regard to the moral nature and value of their own acts, is one of the gravest charges that can be brought against the Free-Church cause, and one to which its advocates seem singularly obtuse and insensible."

A happier or more admirable demolition of our friend's own notion about putting the pew-rents on the alms-basin, and *calling* them "offerings," it would be impossible to find. We thought, when we first read that notion of his, that *he* was "blurring a most vital and important moral distinction in this way," "confusing the idea of alms," and "misleading people in regard to the moral nature and value of their own acts;" and we congratulate him on having, at length, so cleverly *found it out.* As to our singular "obtuseness," we shall probably give him further specimens of it presently.

After thus stating, however, that supporting the clergy in this way of pew-rents, has "no more to do with almsgiving than buying a Bible, or paying the baker or the shoemaker," does the reader suppose that our friend is satisfied with thus contradicting himself? Nay, by no means. Nothing will content him, short of contradicting himself back again to the place he started from. He says, therefore:

"If a man pays his pew-rent in a *right spirit*, it *is* an *offering*. If a man puts money on a plate without a right spirit, it is not an offering. * * * * The claim of any superior purity, spirituality and religiousness, in the Free-Church way of giving, is all fudge. And that men are more likely to give in this way according to their ability, and as God hath prospered them, is an assertion whose boldness we admire. It approaches the sublime."

What is not given "in a right spirit," says our friend," is not

an offering." We know that Cain had not a right spirit; yet we read that he "brought of the fruit of the ground *an offering* unto the Lord;" and also that "unto Cain and to *his offering* He had not respect." Our friend would amend the phraseology of Moses, and would deny that Cain made any offering at all. Korah, Dathan and Abiram had not the right spirit; yet God himself declared that their censers should be taken up out of the burning, "for they offered them before the Lord;" and it was added, moreover, "*therefore they are hallowed.*" Thus proving that an "offering" does not consist wholly in the *spirit* of the offerer; but that it is a hallowed thing, even when the giver is so utterly destitute of the right spirit, as to be made of God to "go down quick into hell." Our friend has simply, with great success, confounded that which constitutes an offering, with that which alone renders the *person* of the offerer acceptable in the sight of God. Cain had the one, Abel both. Korah had the one, Aaron both. Any man may bring his offering. But it is only when the fire of *Love* is kindled under the slain animal, that the offering becomes one of a *sweet-savor* unto the Lord.

But it is amusing to see the facility with which this "right-spirit" restores the departed virtue to pew-rents, and makes them "offerings" once more. It is the old Jesuitical trick of *directing the intention* aright. That was the spiritual alchemy that transmuted all it touched to gold. So here. This pew-rent is roundly denied to be anything different in kind from the dues of the butcher, or the baker, or the shoemaker; and is placed on the same level of spirituality as eating a beef-steak or putting on a great-coat in winter. We suppose, therefore, of course, that by only paying the butcher *in the right-spirit*, the amount of his "bill" may be reckoned an "offering" likewise—equal to anything given in Free-Churches—and so also of the "baker," and the "shoemaker," and the beef-steak, great-coat and all. A large item would then be the charity-account in most families!

And yet we are told that it is a very bold assertion to maintain that men are more likely to give according to their ability on the Free-Church plan, (where the highest motives, and those only, are constantly kept before the people,) than on this other system, which degrades things divine to the level of the butcher and baker; and, as a motive-power for good, confounds grace with groceries. To make such an assertion, we are assured, "approaches the sublime." Perhaps it does. It is none the worse for that. The calling upon men to give up their hold on the things of time and sense, and that on the

basis of simple faith, and hope, and love, and duty towards God, lifts poor fallen man to a height which is otherwise not only unattainable, but inconceivable; and may well be said to "approach the sublime." If our friend thinks this "sublime" a thing to be *avoided*, however, as his language evidently implies, he need feel no uneasiness as to his own position. He is in no danger of approaching any such thing on his principles. He has reached the well-known opposite of it already. In vain do we essay to raise up his eyes in faith towards heaven, or persuade him to lay hold upon the anchor of hope, or beseech him to kindle with the flame of charity. With face bent over obstinately to the earth, he goes on fumbling with his muck-rake among butchers and bakers, beefsteaks and shoemakers, muttering indignantly, "All fudge! all fudge!"

But our fudgy friend would fain draw a very fine distinction between what is paid for the support of the clergy and the incidental expenses of a Parish, and what is paid for the support of the poor, for missions, and other objects. The former he considers as on a par with all other secular business and debts to tradesmen (except when paid in "a right-spirit;") and the other he reckons as alms, charity, offerings, &c. And he is perfectly correct (to say nothing of the exception "in a right-spirit") when the former is paid from pew-rents, and the latter from free-gifts offered on Free-Church principles. But, in order that he may be thoroughly consistent with other parts of his Article, he offers no proofs of this right position, except such as are altogether wrong. In corroboration of his position that the support of the clergy is a mere business-debt, he says:

"The tithes that were given to the Jewish Priesthood were not alms. The Jews did not begin to give alms till after they had paid their tithes. And when God says that in the Christian Church 'they that preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel,' He means to put them on the same footing. Their support is not a matter of alms. Alms lie wholly outside of this matter. It is one of the mischiefs of Free Church that it obscures this distinction, not necessarily, perhaps, but certainly in fact. And this we cannot but consider as most pernicious."

We thank our friend heartily for affirming the obligation of tithes; and also for the acknowledgment that the support of the clergy is, at least, on the same footing under the new Dispensation as under the old. This, as far as it goes, is good Free-Church doctrine. But how was it really under the old Law? What did the Israelites pay tithes *for*? What did they get in return? Was each man who paid tithes entitled to monopolize a part of a bench in the Temple, and keep all other people out of it? We trow not! They were paid purely on Free-Church principles, on the sole motive of duty toward

God. To withhold them was to rob God—not to lose the use of a pew. To pay them was to ensure God's blessing upon the work of obedience and faith—not to secure the exclusive use of a pew. And that personal accommodation in the Temple, during the solemn assembly, had any connection with tithes, was never so much as dreamed of by anybody.

But even supposing that such a connection *did* exist, as rigidly as the connection in our day between pew-rent and pews; what of it? How does it apply in aid of the pew-system? There is not a pewed Church in the world that has adopted as its tariff of prices, that each pew-holder shall pay a *tithe of his income;* and our friend knows it. If "the same footing" prevails at all then, it would only prove that pewed Churches do *no alms at all.* For alms, we are told, do not begin to be reckoned, until after the tithes have been paid. And where is the pewed Church to be found, whose pew-rents, alms, and all other contributions put together, fully amount to the honest *tithes* of its pew-holders? Indeed, greatly as we detest the *exclusiveness* of the pew-system, we would almost be willing to endure it, if the pew-rent demanded, and paid, was a full tithe of the pew-holders' income. But there is no more danger of that, than of their building pewed Churches as costly and as splendid as Solomon's Temple.

But let us see if we can find any true reason for this sharp distinction between the "debt" of supporting a clergyman, (which, we are told, has nothing of alms, or benevolence, or charity, about it,) and that which is given for the support of the poor and other Church objects. Is the one a duty of obligation, and the other a work of *supererogation?* But let us quote once more. Speaking of supporting the Clergy by the offertory, he says:

> "Are the Clergy willing to be put upon the footing of pensioners, men who live upon alms? If that be the place assigned them by their Master, they ought to be content with it, and believe it the best. But is is not; and they do no justice to themselves or to Him in fostering a system in which such a falsehood exists. The general obligations of benevolence, unhappily, set lightly upon men. And if the Clergy allow themselves to fall into a position of standing mendicancy in society, ill paid already, they will soon be paid worse. We shall have a class of clerical Trullibers, &c. . . . . For, talk about spirituality and unworldliness as much as you please, men will be men; the demand will regulate the supply, and in quality as well as quantity."

Now it is of no use to be merely fighting about words. If *alms* be used in its rigidly etymological meaning, as derived from the Greek word ἐλεημοσύνη,—something given from a feeling of *pity* for one in distress,—then that word is inapplicable to the current support of the clergy, (although if we were

maliciously disposed, we would add, that we have known quite a number of clergymen, starving on the pew-system, who were fairly entitled to *pity* by reason of their distress.) But used as denoting, not only "alms" proper, but also the "other devotions of the people,"—all, in other words, that is contemplated in the Offertory,—the distinction is at once seen to be groundless. And this enlarged meaning is evidently the one intended by our friend, for it is the *supporting the clergy by the Offertory* that he is so bitterly complaining of, as reducing them to "a position of standing mendicancy in society." But on looking at the subjects included in the Offertory sentences, as those for which the people should then give, we find that, of the twenty verses, only six are specially devoted to the poor, sick, and needy; and these six mostly at the latter end; while the other fourteen are devoted to general exhortations to liberality in good works, and prominent among them are several specially devoted to the duty of *supporting the clergy:*—the very thing which we are told, is no more a part of a man's alms, than his butcher's bill. And this duty is enjoined, not according to our friend's way of thinking. We do not read, "Let every pew-holder pay his pew-rent for the support of his minister: lest his pew be rented to another;" but rather, "Let him that is taught in the word minister unto him that teacheth in all good things. *Be not deceived. God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap.*" That does not sound much like the professional whine of a "standing mendicant in society." It is Free-Church doctrine; because there is the place in which the advocates of Free-Churches found their doctrine. And if, fresh from the inspired sublimity of the Offertory, you wish to see the perfect flatness and even skeptical tone that is produced by the pew-system, read our friend's brief way of getting rid of Scripture:

> "Talk about *spirituality* and *unworldliness* as much as you please, men will be men; the demand will regulate the supply, and in quality as well as quantity."

From which we infer, that his pew-Church experience inclines him to doubt the very existence of any such things as "spirituality" and "unworldliness:"—which is a very natural result of a pew-Church experience. It proves, also, that the reason why there is no "supply" of those useful articles, must be that, under the pew-system, there is no "demand" for them:—which is just what we have always maintained. And we have also a right to infer, that as the demand upon this "spirituality" and "unworldliness" is great and incessant on the Free-Church plan, the "supply" will be regulated accordingly; and

will also be abundant in "quantity," as well as excellent in "quality." All of which conclusions, inasmuch as they were certainly never intended by our friend, may safely be relied upon as correct.

But perhaps this mixing up the support of the clergy, as only one among the multitude of good works which a Christian is called on to do, and as standing on the same general yet high grounds of duty with the rest, is characteristic only of our modern days, and our modern Offertory. So our friend would seem to think. He says,—"It remained for *modern* times to find out that a pastor's compensation is a charity." We might remind him that the increase of the tithing year in Israel was to be given, not to the Priests alone. There was no such distinction made of old between God's ministers and God's poor. But that increase was given "unto the Levite, the *stranger*, the *fatherless*, and the *widow*." All are mentioned together repeatedly—the Levite first, indeed, but the others are also added. Our friend, himself, however, knows admirably how to correct in one place the error of another; for, not four pages distant from this charge of modernism, he gives an account of the Offertory in the Primitive Church, and its variety in abundance; and adds—with his wonted easy and unconscious success in contradicting himself—"We do not intend to blink *the fact* that the clergy were supported out of these contributions, ... and other Church expenses provided for from the same source. Bingham says that one-fourth was given to the Bishop, one-fourth to the inferior Clergy, one to furnish and repair the Church, and one to relieve the poor." If, after this very conclusive contradiction of the *modernism* of this practice, our readers would like to see our friend contradict himself back again, they need only turn to the page next before our last quotation, and they will read: "That the specific arrangement which the friends of Free-Churches contend for, prevailed in the beginning—Free-seats, public collections on occasions of worship, for their own expenses, &c., *is not certain.*" That will do! He does not intend to blink *the fact*, and he proves the fact to *be* a fact; but, nevertheless,—notwithstanding,—this "fact" is "*not* certain!"

In our days, the dignity of the Clergy is not likely to be easily lowered, so long as it can be helped. Neither Clergy nor laity like the idea. And it is, at first, a suggestion likely to carry weight with many, that the Free-Church plan would reduce the ministry to a position of "standing mendicancy" in society. But let us compare the two modes a little more closely, and see which it is that really degrades the Clergy.

is, indeed, largely supported by tithes; but the payment of tithes has no connection with a *quid pro quo* in the way of *sale or rent of seats* in the House of God. It is a charge upon landed property; and is, so far as it goes, and in theory at least, basing the support of the Church upon the ability of the giver. There is not a Parish in England where the *abuse* of private property in pews has crept in, that has not suffered most severely for it; pews in the Parish Church often doing more to build up and fill the dissenting Chapels, than all other causes put together.

This blighting result has been felt also among us, and felt very strongly, although its full virus has been very extensively weakened by the Free-Church *dilutions*, of which we have spoken. And it is by the aid of these *dilutions*, that Churches, which profess to be conducted wholly on the Pew-system, enjoy a flourishing growth, to the credit of which that *system*, as we have abundantly proved, has no shadow of claim. Our friend, indeed, ignores our argument on that point, and takes credit for all these dilutions as if they sprung naturally from his own system. He is pardonable, however, for that system would be so intolerable without them! He tells us of a Pew-Parish, for instance, where within a few years a new Church has been built costing $60,000, a lot has been purchased and means raised for a Parsonage, and contributions to objects out of the Parish now amount to nearly $1,800 a year. How much of these large sums was raised from the *pew-rents?* And if not raised from pew-rents or pew-sales, what credit can the pew-system claim for the result?

Our statement of the evils wrought by the pew-system, and even as felt among us in spite of all these dilutions, our friend considers entirely too strong. He calls it "ridiculous," and "rodomontade," and respectfully adds, "what the man means, we cannot imagine." He protests, "we know of nothing that at all answers to his descriptions. Our whole experience is a contradiction of them, indeed. We meet this part of the Article by a *flat denial of the whole representation.*" After this "flat denial of the whole representation," it is the most natural thing in the world—seeing that the denial comes from our friend—to find him kindly contradicting it again on the very next page. "That there is *sterility* and *feebleness* in the Church, we know," he tells us; and pray what else did we say, excepting only that our mode of expression was not quite so tame? He is welcome to all the difference between the phrases which he can discover or invent; but he will hardly be able to show that the "*sterility* and *feebleness*" which he admits, are "a

flat denial of the whole representation" of "blight and barrenness" which he denounces as so totally destitute of truth. His only reference to specific facts in this connection, is to the great and prosperous growth of the Church in Connecticut. No one can honor that sturdy and thriving Diocese more than we do; but when we are expected to give more weight to the experience of Connecticut, than to that of all Christendom besides, we must beg to be excused. Nay, we would ask our friend to remember his admission, that "the pew-system is *not* adapted to the purposes of Church-extension;" and he will then be compelled to admit also, that, great as has been the growth of Connecticut on the pew-system, it would have been *far greater on the other.*

We are accused also of "making" our "facts." Now the great facts upon which we laid the main burden of our argument, are patent upon the History of the Church. The Free-Church plan was, as we showed, the mode in which she had gained all her great conquests, from the preaching in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, down to our own day. And the pew-system, from its rise in England, we proved to have been a blight upon the best energies of our Mother-Church. We can hardly suppose *these* to be the facts so stoutly denied; for our friend admits that "the pew-system is not well adapted to the purposes of Church extension;" that our "argument in support of this position is quite conclusive;" and that he "entirely agrees with us." His impeachment of our facts must therefore refer only to the facts which concern the present state of things among us. The "sterility and feebleness" he admits, in general terms. But our enumeration of statistics as to the present degree of success attained in various Free-Churches throughout the Union, he cannot endure. He admits that he is "very skeptical about statistics." He even seems to suspect that he is an "unpardonable unbeliever." And his estimate of himself is correct. Notwithstanding the abundant evidence we then laid before him, he says:—"We are, to-day, without satisfactory evidence of a single well-established, self-supporting, permanently flourishing Free Church. We have read a great many fine stories, but we have *never yet* found one that would bear examination." . . . . "So far as we have made discoveries, they indicate in *every* instance either *falsehood* or *failure.*" That is strong talk. It ought to be well sustained, or it ought not to be indulged in. Let us see how it is justified; and, for the sake of brevity, we will intercalate our running commentary in brackets:—"Look at our Free Churches. We mean to speak respectfully but plainly. 'The Holy Com-

munion,' New York, is an endowed Church, [It is no such thing. It has not the endowment of a dollar's worth of property of any kind,] and to a large extent, moreover, practically a Pewed-Church, [It is in *no* respect practically a Pewed Church,] and a fashionable Church. [This last phrase is simply an unamiable way of admitting that a Free-Church may be made successful, and even attractive, to some "respectable" people. It has been a prevailing superstition in some quarters, that a Free-Church was only "good enough for the poor." Not more than *one-tenth* of the communicants of that Church deserve the epithet of rich or "fashionable."] We have no wish to disparage its excellence or its usefulness. [Then why do it?] It deserves all honor. [Our friend takes rather a queer way of rendering "honor unto whom honor."] But it is *not* a demonstration of the success of the Free-Church system. [Then what does it demonstrate the *success* of?] 'The Church of the Advent,' in Boston, is undoubtedly a very flourishing organization. [*That* is a *fact.*] But it is an incorporation of twelve men, [What of it?] some of them among the wealthiest and most influential of the city, [Well, and what of *that?* Does a Free-Church cease to be a Free-Church because "some" rich and influential men belong to it? We have always claimed that in a Free-Church, "high and low, *rich* and *poor*, one with another," were equal before the Lord, and we have no idea that Free seats are to *exclude* the rich as effectually as Pews exclude the poor. Or does our friend imagine that all the rich and influential people in the Church must, of right, worship only in pews?] and has thus far lived under the healthy irritation of an opposition which has wonderfully quickened its activity and zeal. [This is a backhanded way of admitting that this Free-Church has lived and flourished under a proscription which would have *crushed* any other parish.] Some of these Churches have rich ministers, [the most of them have not;] good and devoted men, we gladly admit, but men with whom the system is a pet, [Is not the *Pew*-system "a pet" with our friend?] with whom income is of little or no consideration, and who, *perhaps*, are the largest contributors to the funds they gather. [*Gratis dictum.*] Others have in them some one or two wealthy laymen, who act the part of patrons, and stand ever ready to make up deficiencies. [That is to say, the system induces some, even of *rich* men, to give "according to their ability,"—a touch of the "sublime" which our friend so ironically ridicules in another place.] Others are aided continually by a stronger parish in the same place, on which they either hang as an appendage, or which looks upon them as charitable establishments for the

poor." [This is, we believe, the position occupied by the Free-Church enterprises in Connecticut. This kind of Free-Churches—being in fact a mere travesty upon the true idea,—is known in other parts of the Church, by the deserved *soubriquet* of *Kitchen Church*, or *Church of Saint Lazarus*. Its root idea is the permanent *separation* of the rich and poor—those two classes whom it is the object of the Free-Church plan to *bring together*. The one proclaims that these different classes of society shall not worship God even in the same building; the other admits them both, on a perfect equality, upon the same floor. The Free-Church movement is responsible, neither in principle nor in practice, for these establishments which are only, like the soup in Oliver Twist, "Very good for the poor?"—though even of them, in that they do good where none would else be done, we might well "ask for more," as Oliver did of the soup. But these Churches are not doing what the true principle demands. They are only the reluctant, clumsy and often penurious *excuses* of rich parishes for *not* doing it.] "Some flourish for a time while the novelty lasts, and then droop and disappear, or become Pewed Churches. Cases of the latter sort are not infrequent. Our eye now falls on the following:—'The Rev. Mr. Ingraham, we learn from the Mobile *Register*, has been forced to resign his rectorship of St. John's Church. It may be remembered that this Church was built as a *Free* Church, and that the Rector was to be supported by the free gifts of the congregation, taken up every Sunday morning, during the reading of the *Offertory*. This has failed. Hence the Rector has felt himself compelled to resign.'" Now in regard to this story about St. John's, Mobile, being a "Free-Church failure," we must call our readers' attention to a nice little bit of poetical justice. In our July Article we gave statistics of quite a number of Free-Churches, all of which came to us, in manuscript, either from the clergyman of each Church himself, or from some one of his most prominent and reliable laymen. Better, or more authentic, information of this kind, is not to be had. It is evidence sufficient for a reasonable man, as far as it goes. Yet our friend doubts the whole of it; denies that we have given satisfactory evidence of a single well-established case; declares that not a single one would bear examination; and boldly asserts *that his* "discoveries" "indicate, in *every instance*, either *falsehood* or *failure*." After thus summarily sweeping away a mass of evidence, all of a respectable kind, and of which, during the space of five months, not a single portion has been proved to be incorrect; what facts does our friend give us on the other side, as to Free-Church failures? Not a single one, except the above

story about St. John's, Mobile; and *that* he swallowed whole from an anonymous newspaper paragraph, without any authentic voucher at all. And the beauty of the poetic justice consists in the fact, that his October Article had hardly been read in type, before an authentic contradiction of that same anonymous paragraph, under the names of perfectly responsible persons, appeared in every Church paper which had copied the account of the *Free-Church failure.* Our friend's charity is of that sort which "believeth all things," *against* Free-Churches, as a matter of course, even without proof, or against proof; but in favor of them, no evidence is sufficient to convince him; he is willingly and conscientiously, an "unpardonable unbeliever." We are sorry, however, that in the above case, we have had to look elsewhere for the contradiction of the story. We are satisfied that this was only owing to the early, and perhaps hasty, preparation of his Article. We doubt not—judging from his readiness in that line—that with a little more time, our friend would instinctively and cheerfully have contradicted the story himself.

But it is time for us to take credit to the Free Church cause, for the admissions made by our friend; and we have the greater right to claim them at their full value, because they are wrung out of him with such evident reluctance on his part, that he contradicts pretty much every one of them almost as soon as it is made. Thus he speaks highly of the Free-Church plan, as being in fact "the Church acting aggressively upon the world." He declares that Free-Churches "are admirable missionary organs on new ground and in populous places." Yet on another page we read that "The Free-Church system is *inapplicable*, in its full development, to the Church, even in its *aggressive* movements." He admits that it "pertains properly to the Church's external aggressive life," and yet, that it will remove the "sterility and feebleness" of which he complains, he "fearlessly denies." He thinks "its theories to a large extent, impracticable, its purposes Utopian, its zeal sometimes Quixotic." "In the full latitude of its pretensions and expectations," he assures us, "it will prove a bubble that will soon break and disappear. As such it will only be known in that immense repertory of impracticable projects which the Church lays up for the amusement of curious antiquarians—amidst ingenious whirligigs that cannot be made to go, and perpetual motions that have ceased to move, ... labeled,—The Free-Church *Dream* of the Nineteenth Century." As to the threatened label which the Free-Church plan is to bear in our friend's antiquarian museum, we would only remind him that "Behold, this *dreamer*

[illegible] before: and we think that the [illegible] realization of the [illegible] signifies *interpret*; and Joseph [illegible] the mystery with which his [illegible]

[illegible] says is one very handsome [illegible] and quaintly "Dream." He [illegible] "It has [illegible] We have no doubt [illegible] it was a symptom [illegible] of civilization. It stands [illegible] solemn obliga- [illegible] It testifies to [illegible] the rights of God's poor, to [illegible] a previous page he [illegible] have a better chance at [illegible] that is one that is [illegible] to them, and [illegible] We trust it will do yet more. [illegible] truth,—truth too [illegible] who will do with [illegible] the very beginning of the [illegible]

[illegible] tells us that *the Pen-* [illegible] *That is expression*; and *he even* [illegible] We *entirely agree* with him. [illegible] We are not de- [illegible] What it is wise or [illegible] and bounds within [illegible] the affairs of her settled [illegible] not steadily and [illegible] the requirements of agencies [illegible] upon the world. [illegible] and discipline. [illegible] and trembling the [illegible] a necessity. [illegible]

[illegible] is that the "means of [illegible] the work of inter- [illegible] the blessing of her own children [illegible] them unto eternal [illegible] the dif- [illegible] "We can- [illegible] of the Church [illegible] that pew-

rents were going to supply such an abundance of *spiritual* aliment to the people, "building them up in the Faith," and "nourishing them unto eternal life," (especially remembering about the butcher, baker, and beef-steak,) we confess we never suspected before, and do not very clearly understand now.

The distinction between Missionary and Parochial work seems to be plausible. But let us look at it for a moment, and see whether any such rigid separation actually exists, or is indeed possible, where the Church is a *living* thing. Free seats are confessed to be "necessary in the effort to enlarge her borders;" and where is the *Parish* whose "borders" are incapable of further enlargement? Free-seats are confessed to be necessary "to bring men within her *pale*;" and where is the Parish in which there are *no* men yet to be brought within her pale? The Free-seat system is confessed to be "the Church acting aggressively upon the world;" and where is the Parish in which there is nothing more left of "the world," for the Church to conquer? Show us such a Parish—nay, in addition to the above impossible requirements, show us the Parish where no more young couples are to be married, and no more children to be born, and no further increase in the Church population is to be expected by emigration or otherwise; and then and there we will grant that there is a Parish where the Pew-system will not hinder the growth of the Church—simply because any further growth would then and there be impossible. There is no city, nor town, nor village, in all this land, sufficiently *finished* to answer the conditions of the hypothesis. Everywhere there are new families rising up, or moving in; everywhere there are Dissenters, Romanists, Worldlings, Nothingarians, Infidels, and blasphemers, to be converted and gathered unto the growing Fold. Everywhere Church-extension is possible, and it is therefore everywhere the first practical duty.

And yet our friend *grants* that "the Pew-system is *not* well adapted to the purposes of Church extension." Our argument he declares to be "quite conclusive." He "entirely agrees" with us. Our "doctrine is true." *That admission settles the whole question.* It is *not* the providing of spiritual edification to the people, it is *not* the building up of the Church's children in our most Holy Faith, it is *not* the nourishing the flock unto eternal life, that is the main charm of the Pew-system in the eyes of its friends. It is the "regular and reliable support" of the ministry—it is the "reliable contracts" with the vestry for salary—that with them so decisively

outweigh all the superior efficacy of Free-seats in the glorious work of Church-extension. They are willing that the work should stagnate; so that the clerical oxen may only grow fat in their stalls. They would demoralize or disband whole regiments of the rank and file in the armies of the Church militant, so that they may only double the rations and multiply the perquisites of the officers. They cry out that the wheels of the conqueror's chariot shall be stayed in mid career of victory; in order that His hungry body-guard may fly upon the spoil.

It is not thus that we have learned the relative importance of the Bread of Life, and the Loaves and Fishes. *Growth*—not "a regular and reliable salary"—is the first great law of practical *life* in the Church. "Preach the Gospel to every creature," and "in all lands," is the command. "Let him that heareth say Come." The constant daily public and private prayer of all Christians everywhere is, *Thy Kingdom come:* and it is their duty to *act* it as well as pray it. We know, moreover, that before that "end come," the Gospel must first "be preached in *all the world* for a witness unto all nations." "Increase and multiply," is the great command of the new creation under the second Adam, as well as to the old creation under the first Adam. It was therefore that we said before, and now repeat,—"To increase, to multiply, to grow, to gather in—this is the chief work the Church is ordained to do. She is the great treasure-house of God's grace, and she must draw all men unto her, that they may receive of Christ and be saved. Growth by the Spirit; growth by the Bride; growth by the Ministry; growth by the voluntary labors of the laity; growth by the spontaneous coming of "whosoever will," that he may take the water of life *freely;* this is the one prime, all-controlling, all-overwhelming instinct; the indispensable and ineradicable *law of life*, to the Church of the living God. This must be obeyed *first*, no matter what else may be postponed or neglected. It is impossible that any *practical* consideration can ever, under any circumstances, be for an instant weighed against it. Whatever clashes with this, therefore, must be done away. Whatever impedes it must be cut asunder. Whatever smothers out the life of it, must itself be destroyed."

The admission, then, that "the Pew-system is *not* well adapted to the purposes of Church extension,"—that "the argument is *quite conclusive*,"—that "the doctrine is *true*,"—is *fatal to the advocates of pews.*" Any further defense of their system is a simple impossibility. There is nothing more to be said. *Causa finita est.*

Only one word more, and, for this time at least, we are done. Our friend is rather free in his use of words. "Quixotic rage," "moon-struck," "all fudge," "merest nonsense," "falsehood," "rodomontade," and similar phrases, are perhaps not the most persuasive amenities in a friendly discussion. But they call for no reply, and hardly for this brief and quiet notice. They stir in us no unpleasant feeling, and no desire for unhandsome retort. Nay, we find it easy to look with good-natured unconcern upon hard words which are only used as a *sauce piquante* for arguments that are so soft, for self-contradictions that are both plentiful and palpable, and for admissions which kindly and completely cover the whole ground in dispute.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY APPLIED TO THE CONDITION, THE RESOURCES, AND THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. By FRANCIS BOWEN, Alford Professor of Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity, in Harvard College. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 1856. 8vo. pp. 546.

As we propose to discuss the subject treated of in this volume at some length in our next No., we simply announce the work here, and add a few remarks upon its design and character.

Political Economy is comparatively a modern science; and is undoubtedly one of the most important sciences of modern times. There is indeed a sense in which it may be called the *theology* of our age; for no deity is worshiped more sedulously than Mammon; and Political Economy is regarded by most men, and in its practical phase, as the science of wealth, and its acquisition. Even in this point of view alone, a work on this subject would be deserving of, as it most certainly would receive, careful and considerate attention.

But it is not for this purpose, nor in this view of it that we have called Political Economy one of the most important sciences of modern times. Not only is it concerned with, and the science of, the material well-being of a community, but so intimately connected is this well-being with many of the deepest questions of polity and of civilization itself, that to it, we must look for a solution of many of the most important and fundamental problems of the future. The social position of the laboring classes—the possibility of civil liberty and political equality, all depend upon questions embraced and discussed within the province of Political Economy.

Professor Bowen has undertaken and executed his task, in no mere spirit of a book-making trade; but apparently with a full appreciation of the momentous interests with which he is dealing. He has entered upon the work in a spirit of calm philosophic insight into the nature of man and of society, and has prosecuted it with a most patient and diligent investigation of the facts and statistics by which his conclusions must be determined. It is in a general view of it, the best general treatise on the subject that has yet been published. It states with ample fullness and the most perfect fairness the great theories of Adam Smith, of Ricardo, and of Malthus, on free trade, rent and population, and answers them in a way, which if it do not prove satisfactory to the reader—as we think it will—will nevertheless present him the grounds upon which to form his own opinions. He has also discussed at great length the theory of money, of paper currency, and of banking, though in our opinion the discussions on this point are not quite so satisfactory as those on the preceding.

As a text book for schools and Colleges it may be thought somewhat too large and full. But if so, it will be only the more satisfactory for the private student and the better adapted to his wants. The fact that the Prof. has had our own country, its resources, institutions, and its experience always in view and drawn his facts and illustrations from that source to so great an extent, will be found to give to the work an additional and peculiar value.

One criticism alone have we to make. It is this: that while the Author has shown great familiarity with every European writer of any note, whether English or Continental, he has not that we recollect so much as once noticed our own countryman, HENRY C. CAREY. This seems a strange omission, not only on account of Mr. Carey's European reputation, but for the reason that he has devoted especial attention to those European theories of Smith, Ricardo, Malthus and Say, which Professor Bowen feels called upon either

to refute altogether or to show to be inapplicable to this country. We have been accustomed to regard Mr. Carey's as one of the great names in the science of Political Economy, and one that will stand hereafter only second to that of Adam Smith, and second even to his, only because he was the founder of the science. We think he is beginning to be so regarded in Europe also. It can hardly be possible that Prof. Bowen does not know how nearly he agrees with Mr. Carey on many of the most important points of his theories. And yet there are several places in Prof. Bowen's work where we have fancied that his own statements would have been somewhat improved if he had possessed as much familiarity with the writings of our countryman, Carey, as with his British and European authorities. But, as it is, we consider it the best work yet published, and as such commend it to the public.

RELIGION IN AMERICA; or an Account of the Origin, Relation to the State, and present condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States. With Notices of the Unevangelical Denominations. By ROBERT BAIRD. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 696. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is in all respects a curious book, and in some respects one of considerable value. In a country where the government tolerates all religions, it is an important question, What is the present *status* of Religion? Which of all the various forms of Religion is most in accordance with our civil Institutions? Which is best suited to the genius of our people? Which is advancing most rapidly? &c., &c. The author, the Rev. Dr. Baird, is and has been for many years connected with the "Evangelical Alliance" movement, and has for the last twenty years resided much of the time on the Continent of Europe. This large portly volume has grown out of a desire in Europe to know something of the condition of Religion in the United States, which seems to be regarded both as an enigma and a bugbear; and from a small work the volume has increased to its present dimensions. It has attracted much attention in Great Britain, especially among the Dissenters; and a former edition was translated into French, German, Swedish, and Dutch, and was extensively circulated all over the continent of Europe. The present movement among ourselves looking toward the great doctrine of the Unity of the whole Body of Christ, can never be discussed intelligently without just such information as this volume proposes to give; and, in fact, the "Evangelical Alliance," so called, is but another attempt to attain a similar important end, though upon an entirely different basis. There is probably no man living who has devoted so much attention as Dr. Baird to an examination of the present condition of the religious denominations in the United States, and the book abounds in information which can hardly be found anywhere else; as will be seen from the account of its contents. It will be noticed that he makes no mention whatever of some scores of Sects with which our country swarms; nor does he stop to ask, over this heterogeneous mass,—"Is CHRIST divided?" But he does name the more important denominations, and, by a standard of his own, divides them off into "Evangelical" and "Non-Evangelical." The Contents are as follows:

The First Book is devoted to preliminary remarks, &c.

The Second Book treats of the early colonization of the country now forming in the United States, the religious character of the first European colonists—their Ecclesiastical institutions—and the state of the "Churches" when the Revolution took place by which the Colonies became independent of the mother country.

The Third Book treats of the changes involved in and consequent upon that event—the influences of those changes—the character of the civil governments of the States—and the relations subsisting between these Governments and the "Churches."

The Fourth Book exhibits the operations of the Voluntary System in the United States—and the extent of its influence.

The Fifth Book treats of the Discipline of the "Churches"—the character of American preaching—and the subject of Revivals.

The Sixth Book is occupied with brief notices of the Evangelical denominations in the United States—their Ecclesiastical polity and discipline—the doctrines peculiar to each, their history and prospects. In this class, he includes Protestant Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Moravians, Dutch and German Reformed, Lutherans, and Quakers.

The Seventh Book treats in like manner of the non-evangelical sects: and in this class, he places the Roman Catholics, Unitarians, Christians, Universalists, Swedenborgians, Jews, Rappists, Shakers, Mormons, Atheists, Deists, Socialists, Fourierists, &c.

The Eighth Book shows what "the Churches" are doing in the way of sending the Gospel to other lands.

Dr. Baird has evidently endeavored to write with entire fairness; and his account of the "Protestant Episcopal Church," though grossly inaccurate sometimes, is, on the whole, as favorable as could have been anticipated. He thinks that more than half of our *thirty-eight* Bishops, and about two-thirds of our 1714 clergy, are "Evangelical;" while "among the laity there is scarcely any sympathy with these semi-popish doctrines;" and that "the progress of Puseyism is much smaller than has been supposed." He concedes the strong position which the Church has gained in the cities and large towns.

Whenever Dr. Baird leaves the *facts*, to discuss the *philosophy* of his history, of course he enters on debatable ground; and there is none more so in the whole field of letters; and here we detect at once his own theological and denominational opinions. Himself nominally an Old School Presbyterian, he dissects and labels through Old School Presbyterian spectacles.

It is impossible that it should have been otherwise. We do not blame him for this; we only speak of it as a feature of his book. Thus his account of the origin of Unitarianism in New England, is that usually given by the "Orthodox;" to wit, that it was the natural fruit of that laxity which had grown out of the "Half-way Covenant," and which was precipitated under the "Revival of 1740" into a formal and visible separation. On the contrary, Unitarianism in New England is one of the natural, and, we may say, necessary fruits of a system of Metaphysical Theology, which has now grown effete. There are other and better fruits of that system, not natural but incidental, yet real and somewhat abundant, to which he has not alluded, and of which we doubt if he has any conception. But Unitarianism has been, to a very large extent, just such a result as we have described; and the process is still going on, and Unitarians are exulting over it. We are sorry to see that Dr. Baird has repeated the old slander on the Church concerning King's Chapel, Boston; a slander which has been again and again exposed. If his book ever reaches another edition, we call upon Dr. Baird, as an honest man, at least to examine that subject more thoroughly. In all matters involving the discussion of theological opinions, the author is to be distrusted. Yet he has given to the public a valuable book, and we thank him for it. As an argument for the "Voluntary System," so called, it will have in Europe great weight. Yet are there two sides to that question; and a large mass of facts pointing in an opposite direction from the object of this book, which do not here appear.

A NEW AND IMPROVED STANDARD FRENCH AND ENGLISH, AND ENGLISH AND FRENCH DICTIONARY, &c., &c. By A. G. COLLOT. Philadelphia: C. G. Henderson & Co. 1856.

A good French Dictionary has been a *desideratum*. Those we had, were either too large or too small, too simple or too complicated. The compilation of Mr. Collot, seems to us, fully and precisely to supply our needs. It is full and yet simple in arrangement in both its parts, satisfactory in definition, and accomplishes, we imagine, as much for pronunciation as can be done without the living teacher.

We have tried it with considerable care, in several points, where we have found other dictionaries insufficient, and it has stood the trial. Its merits ought to insure for it a wide, and for author and publishers, a remunerative circulation.

A valuable addition is the comparative table of Mythological and other names, ancient and modern. We recommend the book without reservation.

POEMS. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, Author of the "Study of Words," etc., etc. New York: Redfield. 1856. 12mo. pp. 336.

Mr. Trench has published several volumes of Poems within the last few years, all of which, we believe, have passed through more than one edition. The Rev. Dr. J. A. Spencer has selected more than half of all his published Poems, and they are embodied in the volume before us. They are all short, several being less than twenty lines, "Genoveva," the longest, and one of the finest, extending to forty pages. This last Poem, "Genoveva," is a versification of a legend of the Middle Ages; and the best of the Poems are those in which Mr. Trench has fashioned anew the traditional romances, tales, and legends of Mediæval and Oriental life. The author, we think, has more true sentiment than poetic genius; and his verses with all their purity and richness of thought, and loftiness of Christian tone, and truthfulness to their subject, are yet often harsh and labored, and lack that musical and easy flow which bespeaks a truly poetic ear. In this judgment, we differ from high authority; but we yield to none in our respect for his rare talents and capabilities, and in our estimate of the vast good which he is accomplishing by his learned writings. Neither is the success of his Poems at the present day to be regarded as sufficient proof of their high poetic merit. When such miserable stuff as "Maud,"

"Dismally dull and dolefully dawdlin,"

can be sent forth by the "Poet Laureate," we may well conclude that the stream of Poesy in England runs decidedly low. The Boston "*Examiner*," (Unitarian,) speaks of Trench as belonging to the "Broad" School; an imputation, as understood by the *Examiner*, wholly undeserved. It is noticeable, with what avidity these persons catch at any intimation that men are growing radical, and untruthful to their principles.

WESTWARD EMPIRE; OR, THE GREAT DRAMA OF HUMAN PROGRESS. By E. L. MAGOON, Author of "Proverbs for the People," "Republican Christianity," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856.

The author of this volume informs us in the preface, that "the philosophy of history resides not in isolated events and detached facts, but flows without interruption down the lapse of ages, the accompaniment of human destiny and the life of ennobling actions;" also, that "fortunately the tide of improvement has already rolled onward so far, and with such increased might, that Oxford is just as impotent to stay the ameliorating progress of mankind, as was the Vatican," a piece of information by which we feel greatly relieved; also, that "all great revolutions in the intellectual world are marked by successive steps of generalization and transitions into wider realms through more expanded truths;" also, that "four mighty landmarks rise prominently to view, around which are concentrated *all* the beneficent institutions, and renowned names, universally admired by the civilized world."

It is only necessary to add, that these four landmarks, are, Pericles! Augustus Cæsar!! Leo X!!! and Washington; concerning the first three of whom this is certainly a discovery; and that in chasteness of style, clearness of expression, profundity of thought, and a good many other things, the volume quite fulfills the brilliant promise of the preface.

SINAI AND PALESTINE, IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR HISTORY. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, M. A., Canon of Canterbury. With Maps and Plans. New York: Redfield. New Haven: S. Babcock. 1856. 8vo. pp. 535.

We were prepared by notices of the English edition of Mr. Stanley's work to see a scholarly and reliable contribution to our literature, descriptive of the Holy Land. Mr. Redfield's edition more than justifies our high anticipation. The learned will search this volume to decide contested points of famous localities, although this was not the main design of the work; Christian divines will read it, to see new light and fresh beauty flash upon the historical, prophetic and devotional portions of the Old Testament. And Christian hearts will follow him as, step by step, he describes places, sacred with the memories and hallowed by the footsteps, of the adorable SON OF GOD. Mr. Stanley made it a point to omit no geographical feature which throws any direct light on the history or the poetry of the Sacred Volume; and, on the other hand, to insert no descriptions except those which have such a purpose. The Maps present not merely the physical features, but the actual coloring offered to the eye of the traveler. He has aimed at greater precision in the use of geographical terms than has been attempted in our authorized Version, and has thrown into an Appendix a catalogue of such words as a help in philological and geographical study. The work contains seven Maps—1st, a diagram of Egypt, Sinai and Palestine; 2d, Egypt; 3d, Peninsula of Sinai; 4th, Traditional Sinai; 5th, Palestine; 6th, South of Palestine; 7th, Plain of Esdraelon and Galilee. After an introductory sketch of Egypt, fragmentary and rapid, yet graphic, Mr. Stanley enters the Holy Land, and proceeds with a most minute description of every point of interest: its geography and physical features, its hills and valleys and plains, its lakes and rivers and fountains, its towns and villages, its sacred localities, sacred and profane history, &c. &c. It should be mentioned, also, that Mr. Stanley, who visited Egypt, Arabia and Syria in the winter of 1852 and the spring of 1853, had before him the "Researches" of our own distinguished traveler, Dr. Robinson, and also M. de Saulcy's "Journey in Syria," two of the ablest late works on these sacred localities. He is, besides a most thorough Biblical and Classical scholar; and his copious foot notes show that he has passed nothing by, ancient or modern, bearing upon his subject.

We have been thus particular in giving the contents of this volume, because it is one which the Clergy, Biblical students, Sunday School teachers, and intelligent Christians, will welcome with pleasure. It is also a delightful book to read. So far from being dull, even old scenes attract us with new beauty under the author's fresh and vigorous style, while the heart is warmed with the devout tone which pervades the work, and with its constant reference to the sacred Volume.

Mr. Redfield has issued the volume in a neat and tasteful manner, and at a very moderate price.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES: A Sketch of its Ecclesiastical History. By HENRY DE COURCY. Translated and enlarged by JOHN GILMARY SHEA. New York: Edward Dunigan & Brother. Baltimore: Murphy & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 591.

It will be recollected that in the seventh and eighth Volumes of the Church Review there appeared two Articles on "Maryland Toleration," proving, beyond a doubt, that "Religious Toleration" in Maryland was not a boon granted by Roman Catholics, and that the popular notion on that subject is a miserable *old wives'* fable, without the shadow of a foundation to stand upon. We are aware that these extravagant pretensions in respect to Religious Toleration, claimed alike in behalf of Maryland Roman Catholics and New England Puritans, have received hitherto the popular assent. They have been announced by popular orators, been taught in our public schools out of Protestant Histories, and even Churchmen have fallen in with the popular current, or been branded as

bigots, and hold up to public odium; for men when they cannot argue, can still sneer and call hard names. There is, however, already a change in public sentiment on this subject, and Mr. Bancroft's later works are not the only proof of it. For the Articles in the *Church Review*, above alluded to, the (Roman Catholic) *Metropolitan* took us to task, thought we were not particularly amiable, but was very careful to dodge our historical details. The history of the [Roman] Catholic Church in the United States by De Courcy and Shea now before us, on this question of Toleration, gives up the point frankly and fully. The real facts in this case were not precisely as these writers state them, but as to this particular question they are explicit and correct. Here is their language:—"Lord Baltimore had seen too well how the English Catholics were crushed by the Protestants, as soon as they were the strongest and most numerous; he should then have foreseen that it would be so in Maryland, so that the English Catholics, instead of finding liberty in America, only changed their bondage. Instead, then, of admiring the liberality of Lord Baltimore, we prefer to believe that he obtained his charter from Charles I *only on the formal condition of admitting Protestants on an equal footing with Catholics.*" p. 30.

We notice that the Roman Catholic press appreciate the importance and probable influence of this History, and *Brownson* is terribly severe towards its authors, especially M. de Courcy, but he is very cautious not to touch his facts. The History itself is by no means what its title indicates. After an imperfect and superficial sketch of the early settlement of the country and the labors of Romish missionaries, the authors do little more than give a general history of the Dioceses of Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and New York. Their account of the mission of the Nuncio, Bedini, to this country shows that it was meant as an experiment which proved to be a great mistake. Their history of the Tractarian movement is full of blunders and misstatements. In speaking of the converts to Popery they forget to tell us how many times ex-Bishop Ives recanted, and at last with this deliberate and solemn declaration:—"And further, to declare my conscientious conviction that our branch of the Church, styled 'the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,' and standing upon the same firm basis with the mother Church in England, belongs to that portion of Christ's body which is the most scriptural, primitive, and truly catholic in its character; *and that no one embraced by holy baptism within its pale can depart from it without the grievous sin of doing despite* to the Holy Ghost." In another edition they will perhaps explain why some of these "converts" have already found their way back to the true Fold from which for a time they had strayed. While the work before us is by no means reliable or complete, it is yet worth looking at to see what the Romanists have been doing.

THE PURITAN COMMONWEALTH. An Historical Review of the Puritan Government in Massachusetts in its Civil and Ecclesiastical relations, from its rise to the abrogation of the First Charter. Together with some general reflections on the English Colonial Policy, and on the character of Puritanism. By the late PETER OLIVER, of the Suffolk Bar. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 1856. 8vo. pp. 502.

The readers of the Second, Third, and Fourth Volumes of the Church Review will recollect as having appeared in them a series of Articles on the Puritan Commonwealth in Massachusetts. The quiet yet fearless manner in which the writer went forward, uprooting popular notions about the Puritan Colonies, justifying himself, too, at every step by Puritan testimony, his avoidance of abusive epithets, but the sweeping nature of the facts which he marshaled with such cool and determined precision—these are not forgotten we know by many. The publication of the series in the Review was then interrupted, when it was less than one third completed. Little did we then know the magnitude of the labors to which the author was devoting himself, or of their importance. It is enough to say, that the whole is now comprised in one large octavo volume with the above title, to which we would invite the attention of the reader. We

do not hesitate to affirm that the work enters, and from a Church stand-point, more thoroughly into an exposition of the genius and spirit of the Puritan Commonwealth than has ever been done before, and with a thoroughness and fullness which must hereafter modify that portion of the Puritan history in the popular mind. The manner in which the Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company was first obtained; its fraudulent transfer to Massachusetts; the perversion of, and abuses under it; the construction, intolerance, and persecutions of the "Puritan Church;" the Puritan Missions, contrasted with those of Virginia, and the Jesuits; the first dawning of conspiracy among the Puritans, and its causes; and the general history, tone, and temper of Puritanism—these the reader will find thoroughly illustrated. The time has come when we ought to begin to take a broad view of the early settlement of our whole country, and as Churchmen we must be willing, as we can well afford to be, honest and impartial. We urge this work upon our readers, therefore, not that they may gratify a virulent, petty and unmanly prejudice, not for the sake of finding weapons with which to assail Puritanism, but as throwing light upon important public questions of policy, administration, manners, morals and religion, on which there has been abroad an almost inconceivable amount of popular error.

WESTERN AFRICA. Its History, Condition, and Prospects. By Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, Eighteen Years a Missionary in Africa and now one of the Secretaries of the Presbyterian Board of Missions. With numerous Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 527. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is the best account of the History, condition and prospects of Western Africa that has been published; it is compendious and yet sufficiently minute for all ordinary purposes. It gives a concise sketch of its ancient Races, and of the two great families, the Ethiopian and the Nigritian; of the early attempts to circumnavigate the continent; of its geographical divisions and features; of the discoveries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by the Portuguese, English, French and Dutch; and then a brief description of the principal divisions of the country from Senegambia down to Angola. It also gives a pretty full description of the Colonies at Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Gambia; and discusses the question of the capacity of the Africans for improvement and the best modes of carrying on Christian Missions in Africa. One of the most valuable portions of the book is its historical sketch of Romish Missions in Western Africa, especially in Congo; where at least one hundred Missionaries were sent, where there were probably not less than one hundred consecrated churches, where for two centuries Romanism was the acknowledged religion of the natives, and where it would have been difficult to find one adult who had not been baptized. And what has been the result of all this surprising zeal and liberality? For some of the most learned and accomplished men whom Rome ever sent forth spent their lives in Congo. Now, every trace of Romanism is gone, and the people of Congo are among the most savage, barbarous, and degraded, of all the heathens of Western Africa. The real secret of this failure was that Romanism never gained a hold upon the moral and intellectual nature of the people. It baptized by crowds; it introduced its ceremonies; but yet it only took away one system of Fetichism and gave another; and, after all, left the people where it found them. Its self sacrifices and heroism of endurance might well cause us to blush; and yet Romanism in Congo proved an utter failure, as it did also in Japan, in Southern Asia and in South America. Mr. Wilson pays a well deserved compliment to our own Missions in Liberia, and to the English Church Missions in Sierra Leone.

There are other respects in which this work is important to the statesman; as it indicates, clearly enough, the vast amount of commerce which is sure to be carried on with the western coast of Africa, and which the British government of course are already endeavoring to anticipate.

THE BLEMMERTONS; or Dottings by the Wayside. By the Rev. JOSEPH J. NICHOLSON. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 423. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

There is ability and character enough in this book of Mr. Nicholson to produce a sensation. It is full of keen hits of an arrow, sharp, and so well barbed, as to be sure to leave its mark. The work is an out-and-out showing up of that purse-proud patronizing class of people who, thoroughly selfish, and ignorant of the first principles of the Church, yet attempt to snub and browbeat the Clergyman who will not fall down and worship the "golden calf," and who presumes to obey God rather than conform to the unprincipled liberalism of the day. The "Blemmerton Family" represent this modern element in American aristocracy; these vulgar, dashing parvenues, who pay for the best seat in Church, and run off to hear "Dr. Riproarer" and "Dr. Skyrocket" whenever they come in town; who figure largely in all charities but Church charities; and who are terribly afraid of Puseyism. Mr. Nicholson has chosen a rich theme; and as he is a bold man and calls things by their right names, he will probably not be reckoned among those of whom "all men speak well." But his book will do good. It shows not merely the defects, but the positive sinfulness of the system of education in most of our Female Boarding Schools; it exposes the utter heartlessness of much which passes as popular philanthropy; it exhibits the pride, self-will, and supreme selfishness of modern liberalism; it reveals the essential difference in the very conception of personal religion as witnessed in the Church System and in the Revival System; and it depicts in glowing colors the underhanded management, the innate vulgarity and meanness of those busy mischief-makers who, almost always, for a time, dog the steps of the faithful uncompromising Church Minister.

The book has its faults. The picture is sometimes overdrawn. The story has too many episodes. The names of his characters are sometimes too significant to be in good taste. Thus "Mr. Weak in-the-Upper Story" is almost as bad as those ridiculous appendages with which the old Round-heads used to grace their offspring. The tone and temper are not always such as to conciliate those who are only nominal Churchmen, but yet who are often such from ignorance rather than conviction. Still, there is an element in modern society, a selfish, vulgar, supercilious, and mischievous element, which needs to be rebuked; and the story of "The Blemmertons" is well adapted to do it.

CALDERON; HIS LIFE AND GENIUS. With Specimens of his Plays. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D., Author of "The Study of Words," &c. New York: Redfield. 1856. 12mo. pp. 233.

There are few of our readers to whom this volume will not open up a field almost entirely new. The introductory Essay is devoted to an account of the Spanish Drama, and to a sketch of the life, character, and works of Calderon, the greatest Spanish dramatist. Mr. Trench also gives an analysis and a partial translation of two of his dramas, viz, "Life's a Dream," and "The Great Theatre of the World." Mr. Trench says there are but three great original dramatic literatures in the world, the Greek, the English, and the Spanish; and as the noblest and best representative of the Spanish, Calderon came upon the stage when Cervantes had just left it, when Spain had already more than reached the acme of her glory, and he was therefore the last fruit to ripen into full maturity, of a tree which had already begun to decay. For a full sketch of Calderon's life and for an elaborate criticism of his works, as well as for the varied estimate in which he has been held by literary writers, we must refer to the volume itself. It will gratify and reward the study of those who have any true taste for literature.

As Mr. Trench is not to be Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, which appointment it is said he lost by the caprice of a woman, his new position, as successor of Dr. Buckland, will give him, we trust, abundant opportunities to prosecute

those studies by which he has already won an enviable reputation, and not less in our country than in his own.

THE RECENT PROGRESS OF ASTRONOMY; Especially in the United States. By ELIAS LOOMIS, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 396.

This is a third and enlarged edition of the best popular work of Astronomy yet published. The progress of astronomical discovery within the last fifteen years has been very rapid, and the advances made in the United States, both in the facilities for observation and the number of active observers, are in the highest degree gratifying. The Messrs. Professors Bond of Cambridge, Professor Mitchell of Cincinnati, and Professor Loomis of New York, are already associated in reputation with Herschel, and Hind, and Le Verrier, and the cleverest European discoverers. Prof. Loomis' book though scientific is adapted to the capacity of every person of ordinary intelligence; and the success of such a work shows how generally a taste for scientific pursuits is diffused among the American people.

THE HILLS OF THE SHATEMUC. By the Author of the "Wide, Wide World." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 516. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

They who have read Miss Warner's previous stories have no need to be told that her pen is a fountain of genuine sentiment, pure, fresh and gushing as the limpid waters from her native hills. Here is where her merit chiefly consists, and here is her hold upon the large circle of her admirers. Critics may find fault with the artistic merits of this production, may pronounce this scene unnatural, and that picture overdrawn, and yet the heart will respond to the truthfulness of her delineations. The author is much more at home in rural life than amid the artificialities of the city, where the heart, too, is either frozen by rigid conventionalisms, or spurns and tramples upon them at the sacrifice of truth and honor. Winthrop and Elizabeth, the principal heroes, illustrate not only some of the noblest of human virtues, but some of the most important duties of the Christian life and character. The story ends if not with a marriage, at least with an engagement, to which we presume young girls will think Winthrop came in altogether too calculating a manner. Yet his heart was in the right place at last, at least we hope they will think so.

THE DOUBLE WITNESS OF THE CHURCH. By the Rt. Rev. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D. D. Seventh Edition. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1856.

We know of no work in defense of the Church, on the whole, so well adapted to general circulation as Bishop Kip's "Double Witness."

THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY, revised and brought down to the present time. By W. P. STRICKLAND, D. D. With an Introduction by Rev. W. L. RICE, D. D., of Cincinnati. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 512. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This large volume presents a full, and, we presume, reliable history of the American Bible Society from its establishment in 1816, down to the present time; its Officers, Constitution, operations, translations into upwards of twenty different languages, its distribution of the Bible into Canada, Mexico, South America, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Austria, Sandwich Islands, China, India, Ceylon, Africa, the Levant, &c.; also its Agencies, Legacies, &c.; and, in an Appendix, portions from Speeches made in its behalf. The volume claims to have been written in a "*Catholic*" spirit; and yet the author on the first page of his history, says, "amid the surrounding darkness of Church and State, and the efforts to abridge ecclesiastical and civil liberty, the *Puritans*, with their open Bible, nobly contended for the faith, * * * they came to this land to make it the land of the Bible and of freedom; to worship God as revelation and conscience might teach." Now, what had all this to do with the "history"

of the American Bible Society, even if it were true? Why attempt, at the sacrifice of truth, to gain a sectional, partisan, narrow and contracted end? We see among its early founders and constant and most efficient supporters, down to this day, the names of many prominent Churchmen; while as an Institution it was anticipated by twelve years by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and also more or less in time, by at least twenty-four other European and Foreign Bible Societies. Although Churchmen believe it to be their bounden duty to send the living teacher and minister *with* the written Word, yet they can never feel otherwise than a deep interest in spreading that matchless Version which Churchmen first gave to the Anglo-Saxon race, and which they have done most to scatter among the nations.

MODERN GREECE: A Narrative of a Residence and Travels in that Country, with Observations on its Antiquities, Literature, Language, Politics and Religion. By HENRY M. BAIRD, M. A. Illustrated by about sixty engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1856. 12mo. pp. 380.

This work professes to be little more than a narrative of the author's observations during the single year which he spent in Greece, and mostly in Athens pursuing his studies, together with a brief description of celebrated places which he visited during this brief period. It is popular and sketchy rather than learned and philosophic. The thoughtful reader is left with a disheartening impression as to the prospects of religion, learning, and civilization among the Greeks, depressed by so many centuries of subjugation, and saddled, even now, with a Government which has no hold on popular confidence, but is regarded with deep-seated aversion.

The work is well worth reading for its descriptions of society, and of the present condition of the country, and of what is now being done for the elevation of the people of Modern Greece. Favorable mention is made of the labors of our own devoted Missionary, Mr. Hill. Mr. Baird thus describes the priesthood of the Greek Church:

"The ignorance and degradation of the clergy forms the gloomier aspect of the picture. Springing from the lowest class of society, they are notoriously illiterate and immoral. So deeply rooted has the notion of their debasement become in the popular mind, that when a boy is unruly, and his parents have failed in persuading him to learn some honest trade, they frequently consider the Church their last and only resource. This idea is embodied in the current proverb, which may be rendered into English by the couplet—

'Vicious and ignorant, gluttonous beast,—
Nothing remains but to make him a priest.'

But when the fact is known, that until lately there has been no provision for their education, beyond schools where they might learn to read and write, such a state of things will scarcely excite surprise."

HISTORY OF GREECE. By GEORGE GROTE, Esq. Vol. XII. Reprinted from the London edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 590.

Of all the Histories of Greece to which we have access, we give the palm to Grote. It is unquestionably better, more appreciative, more reliable, more truly philosophical, than Gillies', or Mitford's, or Thirlwall's. The author brings his narrative down to "the close of the generation cotemporary with Alexander—the epoch from whence dates not only the extinction of Grecian political freedom and self-action, but also the decay of productive genius, and the debasement of that consummate literary and rhetorical excellence which the Fourth Century B. C. had seen exhibited in Plato and Demosthenes." More than half of the present volume is devoted to the life and conquests of Alexander, when Greece proper could scarcely be said to exist, for her intellectual brightness was bedimmed, and her spirit broken.

Her speculative Philosophy still remained, however; and the two bright names which tower in grandeur as the loftiest intellects of ancient times, Plato and Aristotle, these will form the subject of a work yet to appear. This concluding volume of the History contains an excellent Map, and a complete Index to the whole work.

SERMONS ON THE PUBLIC MEANS OF GRACE; ON THE FASTS AND FESTIVALS OF THE CHURCH, SCRIPTURAL CHARACTERS, AND VARIOUS PRACTICAL SUBJECTS. By the late Rt. Rev. THEODORE DEHON, D. D. Bishop, &c., South Carolina. Second American Edition. With additional Sermons never before published. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1856. 8vo. 2 Vols. pp. 524, 535.

Mr. Stanford has done a good thing to publish a new edition of the excellent Sermons of Bishop Dehon; as the former edition was long since exhausted, and of three English editions not a single copy remains unsold. The Sermons, which are all short, are admirably adapted for reading in Churches where there is no minister, as well as for private instruction; for there is in them a soundness of doctrine, a cogency of argument, a fervor of devotion, a warmth and glow of emotion, and a chastened yet fervid eloquence of style well calculated to win the attention, instruct the mind, and captivate the heart.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, &c. 12mo. 1856. pp. 863.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, &c. 24mo. 1856. pp. 576.

Mr. Stanford, of the old New York Church Book-Store, has just issued editions of the Prayer-Book of the above sizes. The 12mo. edition is one of the most elegant books ever issued from the American press; the 24mo. is so compact as easily to be carried in the pocket or reticule.

THE CLERGYMAN'S COMPANION. By JOHN HENRY HOBART, D. D., late Bishop of New York, &c., &c. New York: Thomas N. Stanford. 1855. 12mo. pp. 128.

This is a new edition of a well known and most valuable Manual, more convenient to carry than the former edition; and more acceptable, as that was edited by one who went out from us because he was not of us.

THE OLD REGIME AND THE REVOLUTION. By ALEXIS DE TOQUEVILLE, of the Academie Francaise. Author of "Democracy in America." Translated by John Bonner. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 344.

M. De Tocqueville has been known as a political writer heretofore wholly by his work on Democracy, in which he showed great powers of observation and analysis; and he has now, after a silence of twenty-six years, come forward with a work so vigorous, so thoroughly cool and philosophical, so fresh in its delineations of the hidden current of the national life, that it must create a sensation. He gives a searching examination, not of the men, the actors, but of the real working of the institutions under the *old regime*, the relative position of various classes of society, the condition and feelings of those classes, the political maxims and philosophy which had taken possession of the people, in a word, those hidden causes which made the Revolution a matter of inevitable necessity. Nor is his work without its bearing upon the France of the present day. "I trust," says M. De Tocqueville, in his Preface, "that I have written this work without prejudice: but I cannot say I have written without feeling. It would be scarcely proper for a Frenchman to be calm when he speaks of his country and thinks of the times in which we live. I acknowledge, therefore, that in studying the society of the Old Regime in all its details, I have never lost sight of the society of our own day." The history of the French Revolution has often been written. The same elements which ripened into startling development there, a little sooner were germinating all over Europe; and the lesson which that Revolution taught, will not be forgotten for centuries to come. The work before us is worthy of its author, and will repay a careful study.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES. Letters to Ernst Moritz Arndt, on the Dangers to Religious Liberty in the present state of the World. By CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN. Translated from the German by Susanna Winkworth. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 440. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

The freedom and boldness with which Chevalier Bunsen has mingled in the discussion of some of the most important theoretical and practical questions of the day, give to this volume an interest even beyond its own merits. The "Signs of the Times" which Chevalier Bunsen notes, are the development of the spirit of association on the one hand, and the evident increase of the power of the Clergy on the other; the aspirations of the nations after freedom of conscience, and the desire of the Clergy for the suppression of that freedom. The position which the author takes, is, that on the Continent of Europe, and especially in the German States, a strong and combined effort is now in operation on the part of the authorities of the Romish Church, in connection with the State, to repress the tendency to freedom of association and to trample upon the right of every National Church to govern itself. There is no doubt that all over Europe, and especially in Austria and Prussia, the Ultramontanists were never more busy than now; and yet in doing so, the Chevalier shows that Popery is violating old national compacts and rights, heretofore acknowledged to be sacred. He traces, incidentally, the same two opposing elements in Russia, France, Sweden, and elsewhere. The historical details and public documents which the author gives, pertaining to the Church in Prussia and Austria, if they detract somewhat from the popular interest of the work in the United States, do not detract from its value and importance. And it is noticeable that three large editions of this work were called for in Germany, within three months after its publication. Whatever may be the fact as to the Chevalier's orthodoxy, he is a sagacious man, and we are glad to see the rising indications that Prussia, England, and the United States, will join hand to hand on the battle ground against a political priestcraft and spiritual despotism, which must sooner or later come to an end. We wish we were equally confident that these three nations will agree as to those elementary principles of Christianity, without which freedom of conscience is only another name for popular infidelity. The moment the Chevalier begins to theorize and dogmatize, as, for example, in the latter part of the Tenth Letter, he shows his incompetency to grasp the great spiritual verities which condition the Church's freedom, life, and power. His German type of mind, and habit of thought, and fondness for religious speculation, spoil him for a religious teacher.

ROCKFORD PARISH: *Or the Fortunes of Mr. Mason's Successors.* By JOHN N. NORTON, A. M., Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky. Author of "The Boy who was trained to be a Clergyman;" "Full proof of the Ministry," etc. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 216. New Haven: Geo. B. Bassett & Co.

The secret of the success of Mr. Norton's books on the Church, lies in their unpretentiousness, and in the simple, straightforward style in which he narrates incidents in common life where the practical working of sound Church principles is developed. He does not give us learned quotations from the Fathers nor elaborate arguments to show that the English Reformers did hold to this, and did not hold to that; but he exhibits the Church at work, and as she appears in those every day occurrences of which life is made up. We have here the successors of Mr. Mason in Rockford Parish; first, there is the Rev. J. *Primrose* Peterjohn; the man who had talent but did not have tact, who was a preacher but not a pastor; and whose stay in Rockford was very short. Then there is the Rev. Henry Dusenbury; "*Brother* Dusenbury," as the various preachers called him; who talked about the "*Sabbath* School," and straightened up his back at the name of JESUS in the Creed, and whose amalgamation tendencies made him plenty of trouble in the end. And next, is the Rev. Mr. Howard; a faithful, hardworking, sensible man. And then, besides other characters, there

is the Missionary Parish at Bedfordville, and a sketch of the thousand and one obstacles always to be overcome in such an undertaking, the prejudices to be outlived, and the open and underhanded assaults to be met. We have a suspicion that Mr. Norton has not drawn on his imagination for some of the materials of his story; here and there, we detect what, we doubt not, are the sober realities of real life. The book is sure to be useful; it is in that quiet, yet earnest, loyal tone, to which the heart of the Church is more and more responding as she is nerving herself up to her responsibilities.

PEEPS FROM A BELFRY. By Rev. F. W. SHELTON. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 304. New Haven: Geo. B. Bassett & Co.

THE RECTOR OF ST. BARDOLPH'S; *or Superannuated.* By the Author of "Salander and the Dragon." New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 344. New Haven: Geo. B. Bassett & Co.

These are new editions of works of which we have already expressed our opinion, and which are already well known to our readers. Mr. Shelton is a fine classical scholar, his style is of the Addisonian cast, and he is one of our very best and purest writers.

REV. ADAM TOWNLEY'S SERMON, on "The Church the Channel of Personal Holiness." Paris, C. W.

Mr. Townley discusses two important questions: 1st, Wherein we come short of our position, and of those who lived in earlier days? and he answers: in the brevity and coldness of our public devotions; in the meanness of our public and private charities; and in our indifference to the spread of Christ's Kingdom. His next question is as to the cause of this degeneracy? And he finds that cause, in the "sad want in us of *that simple confidence* in the promises of JESUS EVER TO DWELL IN HIS CHURCH AND SEND HIS SPIRIT THROUGH HER ORDINANCES, which so preëminently marked the faith of the early Church: and to this infidelity of heart as respects Christ and the Comforter being in His Church, we do mainly attribute the want of holiness amongst ourselves. The early Church, and indeed our fathers, believed all these promises in their fullness and simplicity; they looked for Christ and His blessed Spirit in every institution and ordinance connected with His Church."

There is no one feature of Protestant Christendom in these days more marked, than in the tendency in some quarters, and the design in other quarters, to ignore the Church as a visible, positive, divine institution. Men talk about Christianity, not about Christ; about the Gospel, not about the Church. The early Continental Reformers used a language on this subject which now would be branded as Puseyism and what not; yet men, like John Wesley, said, "We believe there is and always was in every Christian Church (whether dependent on the Bishop of Rome or not) an outward priesthood, ordained by Jesus Christ, and an outward sacrifice offered therein, by men authorized to act as ambassadors of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God."

For ourselves, we believe the Church will never do her duty until her individuality and her prerogatives are asserted with Scriptural fidelity; and this will be done only in defiance of a philanthropic infidelity, and a false-hearted liberalism. Let her show her colors, and honor her profession by her works, and her reproach will cease.

It is a striking historical fact that *Church* radicalism inevitably leads to *Doctrinal* radicalism; and that loyal Churchmanship is the only surety-ship for the safety of Evangelical Truth. Thus the Unitarian Quarterly (Boston) for Nov., speaking of Mr. Jowett, says, and says with the greatest propriety: "If it is found that a few more men of equal weight can follow him in his thorough and candid dealings with the old bugbears of Scripture criticism, and can still remain in the English Church, we shall expect to see our own brotherhood broken up, as respects anything like a visible and distinct fellowship, by a virtual invitation extended to ministers and brethren to fall back into the Establishment."

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW. Oct. 1856.

In this always most remarkable Periodical we find the following remarkable paragraph, which we commend to the attention of those beardless reformers among ourselves who walk in long garments, sneer at the English Reformers, and think all that is necessary to usher in the Millenium, is, to reintroduce the architecture, music, costume, and ceremonialism of the Middle Ages. Brownson says, "in proportion as we plunge deeper into mediæval society, and recover from that excessive admiration of everything mediæval which was the fashion a few years ago with a large class of English, French and German writers, the more defective do we find that society, and the less are we disposed to wish, even if it were possible, its reproduction."

And again, he says: "We should be loth to maintain that under every point of view Sicily and Naples, Spain and Portugal, Mexico and South America are superior in civilization to Great Britain and Holland, Sweden and the United States."

THREE YEARS ON THE KANSAS BORDER. By a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church. New York: Miller, Orton, & Mulligan. 1856. 12mo. pp. 240.

THE CONQUEST OF KANSAS BY MISSOURI AND HER ALLIES. A History of the troubles in Kansas from the passage of the Organic Act until the close of July, 1856. By WILLIAM PHILLIPS, special correspondent of the New York Tribune, for Kansas. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 414.

Amidst the whirlpool of excitement on Kansas our words would be unheeded. Besides, we are satisfied that the position of total abstinence from politics by the Church, *as such*, is a wise position. They who do not believe in the Church, and they who believe in her only to hate her, will of course scoff at her and her Ministers for the stand taken on this subject. These can afford to bide their time.

MEMOIRS OF CELEBRATED CHARACTERS. By ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE, Author of "History of the Girondists," etc., etc. In three volumes. Vol. III. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin square. 1856. 12mo. pp. 328.

Lamartine is the most brilliant writer of the modern "French School;" and we have here portraits of five distinguished characters, William Tell, Madame de Sévigné, Milton, Autar, and Bossuet. Bossuet and Madame de Sévigné are drawn with much more truthfulness, elegance, and grace, than the radical old English Puritan, Milton, whom Lamartine fails to appreciate; for no Frenchman can do justice to a genuine Englishman.

HARPERS' SCHOOL HISTORY. Narrative of the general course of history from the earliest periods to the establishment of the American Constitution. With questions for the use of schools, with 150 maps and engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 450. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is a book by JACOB ABBOTT, is evidently prepared with great care, and deserves the attention of the teachers of Primary and Common Schools. Its important peculiarity is in the lucid order of the arrangement, and in the simple, concise, yet attractive language in which the leading events of History are narrated. The author begins at the earliest period, and comes down through the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, Roman, and British Empires, to the organization of the American Republic and the establishment of the American Constitution. While it is not a universal history, it yet traces the line of events which leads to and is most connected with the history of our own country. It is equally well adapted to school and private libraries.

THE AMERICAN POULTERER'S COMPANION. A Practical Treatise on the Breeding, Rearing, Fattening, and general Management of the various Species of Domestic Poultry. With Illustrations and Portraits of Fowls taken from Life, Poultry Houses,—Coops, Nests, Feeding-Hoppers, &c., &c., &c. A New Edition enlarged and improved. By C. K. BEMENT. With 150 Illustrations on wood and stone. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 304. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

To the great mass of Americans, running the maddened chase for gold, such an elaborately prepared book as this, with its numerous illustrations, will doubtless seem to be a funny affair. But Mr. Bement, the author, is full of his subject, and the reader is given to understand, at once, that that subject is not one to be trifled with. See how he describes what has already been done in the raising of poultry. "No one conversant with poultry can attend our markets without seeing evidences of great improvement. Many specimens show increased compactness, roundness, and symmetry, shorter leg, clean head and neck, fuller and closer feathers, etc.!" If the patrons of the turf do not find a new genus of the animal creation competing for popular admiration, it is not Mr. Bement's fault. But seriously, the book is a useful one; and the thousands of our citizens who, blessed with wealth and love of repose, are retiring to their country villas: and, still more, as a matter of "political economy," the multitudes who are engaged in this kind of traffic at the markets, will find this the very book for their use. Mr. Bement tells us that in New York about *two millions*, and in Boston about *one million* of dollars are expended annually for eggs. The poulterer will find the whole subject here illustrated, with a drawing of "Queen Victoria's Poultry-House," &c., &c., dissertations on the various species of domestic fowls, &c., &c., &c.

DRED: A TALE OF THE GREAT DISMAL SWAMP. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 329, 370.

Perhaps we ought not to speak at all of this work, for we confess we have not read it through, though we sat down with that intent. But the work is too tedious for us. As a work of art its faults are glaring. The story has no beginning and no end. "Dred," or the character drawn under that name, is an unreality: no such character ever did live, or ever will. Its description of Southern Christians is a most gross caricature, conceived in ignorance or prejudice; and there is, throughout, an undercurrent of vulgarity and indelicacy which may possibly pass for genius among those whose morbid appetites crave such *pabulum*. What possible good such a work can do, either at the North or the South, we cannot imagine. Its only effect will be, to keep alive an irritated and mischievous state of feeling at home, and to present a most perverted view of the subject abroad. The book we see has a large sale, while works of standard worth are multiplying on the shelves of the book-stores.

It is a little funny that just as her book is in press Mrs. Stowe, and *Mr. Stowe*, hasten to England to receive again the greetings of English nobility and aristocracy, who imagine themselves thus administering a terrible rebuke on American slavery. But this time, Mrs. Stowe finds a rival. An English paper says, "The same ladies who, in a storm of indignation, would, with their scissors, cut the offending Jonathan into as many pieces as his flag has stars—the same gentlewomen courtesy low to Mirza Wallee Ahud Bahador, and admire the 'ladies' of his harem amazingly."

A CHILD'S HISTORY OF ROME. By JOHN BONNER. Uniform with "A Child's History of the United States," by the same Author. Richly illustrated. 2 vols. 16mo. Muslin. $1.00. pp. 307, 311. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

Mr. Bonner has paid that regard to the critical rule of Prof. Niebuhr in respect to early Roman history which is justly due. That is, he has repeated

those fabulous stories which from the time of Livy have been received; but he has repeated them as legends, and not as veritable facts of history. He begins his "real History" of Rome with the times of Pyrrhus; and traces it down to the subversion of the Empire in the year 476, and the irruptions of the Goths, and the Vandals, and the Huns. Mr. Bonner does not profess to write as a learned and profound historian; his aim is to bring the History of Rome within the comprehension of children and to render it attractive to them; and that object he has accomplished. There is, however, a noticeable degree of pertness in all that he says, respecting the introduction of Christianity into Rome, and the characters of such persons as Constantine, and Julian the Apostate, who he says "was a very good Emperor;" and there is, also, throughout the work, a habit of wholesale and indiscriminate praise or censure, a cool and flippant infallibility on points where wise men are usually a little modest, which is the great fault of these popular little volumes.

The Sign of the Cross; or, Edah Champlin. By Lucy Ellen Guernsey. 12mo. pp. 309.

Bread Upon the Waters. By Mary E. Bradley, with a note of introduction from Cousin Alice. 18mo. pp. 252.

Sarah Barry's Home. A Sequel to the Christmas Gift. By Jane A. Eames. 18mo. pp. 206.

The Jewels of the Lord, and the Lord of the Jewels. 18mo. pp. 134.

These are all recent issues of the Sunday School Union and Church Book Society. They are very handsomely printed and illustrated, are attractively written, are sound and practical in their teaching, and will be sure to do good.

Bishop Whitehouse's Annual Address to the Convention of the Diocese of Illinois. Sept., 1856.

As we read the record of the Bishop's labors and official duties performed, and notice the rapid growth of the Church in Illinois, several new parishes having been admitted into union with the Diocese during the late Convention, and *twelve* or *fifteen* new churches being in course of erection, we cannot but hope for the speedy restoration of that mutual confidence and coöperation which, under God, alone are necessary to make the Church's position in Illinois a glorious one.

Bishop Doane's Twenty-Fourth Episcopal Address. Trinity Church, Newark, N. J. May 28, 1856.

The Bishop's earnestness, energy, and efficiency, are reflected in this annual record of official labors and Church progress.

Harper's Story Books. No. 23. The Alcove. No. 24. Dialogues. No. 25. The Great Elm.

This series of story-books will make a nice little present for the children. The works are uniformly moral, entertaining and instructive; are published monthly at three dollars a year; and the postage of each Number is two cents.

Hymns for Little Children. Twelfth Edition. 1856. London and New York.

Moral Songs. Sixth Edition. 1856. London and New York.

These are juvenile publications, by an English lady, published by Joseph Masters, London, and sold in New York by Dana & Co. The Author has the rare gift of a true poet, and knows how to write for the hearts of little children.

Four Letters to a Baptist. By a Layman of Alabama. 1856. 12mo. pp. 36.

A good tract in defense of the Church, and is especially adapted for circulation among the numerous sect of Baptists.

THE REV. PROF. TREVETT'S ADDRESS before the Association of the Alumni of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. Aug. 6, 1856.

REV. N. H. SCHENCK'S SERMON, on "Christian Moderation;" in Rosse Chapel, Harcourt Parish, Gambier, Ohio, Sept. 28, 1856.

We are glad to see such a Sermon from Gambier. It is a strong announcement of a great principle lying at the foundation of any correct notions of Church comprehension and Christian Unity. Such views are silently but yet decidedly spreading in the Church, and will be hailed by all who are not imbued with the spirit of papal or puritan sectism.

REV. T. P. TYLER'S (of Batavia W. N. Y.) Sermon on "Elements of Success in Life," before the Rev. Mr. Everest's Rectory School, Hamden, Conn., July 6, 1856.

A most appropriate discourse, full of the deepest wisdom, before one of the best Schools in the country.

REV. WILLIAM F. MORGAN'S SERMON, "A Pleasant Child," in Christ Church, Norwich, Conn, on the death of Edward B. Chappell. An excellent discourse on the faults and duties of the times in respect to the government of children.

REV. DR. WILLIAM BACON STEVENS' SERMON, "Love is of God;" in Grace Church, Newton, Mass., August 17, 1856.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF YALE COLLEGE, 1856-57.

There are in this flourishing Institution 598 Students and 45 Instructors. The Students are divided as follows:

Law,	30	Seniors,	105
Medical,	27	Juniors,	105
Theological,	23	Sophomores,	128
Philosophy and Arts,	46	Freshmen,	134
	126		472
Total,			598

PUBLICATION OF THE ASSOCIATE ALUMNI of the General Theological Seminary for 1856.

We have here the modest, sound and sensible Essay of the Rev. Dr. Hicks, on the "Origin, Nature and Limits of Ministerial Responsibility," an Essay well calculated to guide, quicken, and console Christ's Ministers; and a Sermon by the Rev. Dr. J. A. Spencer on the "Foolishness of preaching."

THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL REPORT of the Bishop White Prayer Book Society. Philadelphia. 1856.

This is one of the most noiseless, economical, and efficient of all our Church charities.

THE PASTOR PREPARING HIS FLOCK FOR CONFIRMATION, in Four Lectures: and also a Catechism on the Order of Confirmation. By the Rev. ALEXANDER WATSON, M. A., Curate of St. John's, Cheltenham. Adapted to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. New York: Dana & Company, 381 Broadway. 1856. pp. 61.

In reprinting this English work in this country, much unnecessary matter has been left out, allowing the book to be sold at about one quarter of the price at which it was published in England. It has been also adapted to correspond with our Book of Common Prayer. The contents consist of Four Lectures, on the following subjects:—1, The obligations of the baptismal covenant; 2, The origin,

nature, and design of Confirmation; 3, The order of Confirmation in the book of Common Prayer; 4, the duty of the newly confirmed in reference to the Holy Communion. To these are appended a short Catechism, explanatory of the rite of Confirmation. This will be found a very convenient manual for the use of clergymen and others in preparing classes to assume in Confirmation, the obligations of their baptismal vows.

ARCTIC EXPLORATIONS; The Second Grinnell Expedition in Search of SIR JOHN FRANKLIN, 1853, '54, '55. Illustrated by upwards of three hundred engravings from sketches by the Author. By ELISHA KENT KANE, M. D., U. S. N. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 464, 466. 1856. Philadelphia: Childs & Peterson.

Previous to Dr. Kane's leaving Philadelphia, a public dinner was tendered him by a committee of gentlemen, among whom we find the names of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Potter, Hon. Richard Vaux, Mayor of the city, Hon. Horace Binney, &c., &c. The Royal Geographical Society of London, on his late arrival, welcomed him with appropriate marks of their high appreciation of his services to the cause of Science. It was moved by Sir Roderick Murchison, V. P. R. G. S., and seconded by Captain Sherard Osborn, R. N., F. R. G. S., and unanimously carried: "That, on the occasion of the arrival in this country of the eminent Arctic explorer, Dr. Kane, of the United States, for his arduous and skillful endeavors, under the auspices of Messrs. Grinnell and Peabody, to rescue Franklin, and the important additions he made to geographical knowledge, receive the gold medal of the Society; *Resolved*, that the president do communicate, on the part of the members, the expression of their sincere regret upon hearing that this distinguished man should have been prevented by ill health from appearing at the meeting, to receive the unanimous and hearty welcome which awaited him."

Such testimony, of itself, is proof that the work before us is one of which our whole country may be proud. It is not a record of scientific investigations; it is composed for the most part, of extracts from the journal of this heroic man; and gives with touching simplicity and becoming modesty, a narrative of startling discoveries, and of strange adventures, which, in thrilling interest, surpass all the powers of romance. Of course, the great event of the expedition, and one which will immortalize the Author, was the discovery of the open Polar Sea. The existence of such a sea has now become an established fact; and our scientific Savans must give a solution of a mystery which seems to set at defiance our past inductions. The work is published elegantly. Paper, presswork, engravings, maps, &c., are all in admirable keeping with the design of the publication. The work will exert a prodigious humanizing power, though Peter Moneybags, Esq., will of course ask "to what purpose is this waste?" We hope the elegant volumes will be received in a manner worthy of a high-souled, noble-hearted, generous people, a people prompt to honor and reward such intrepid daring in so worthy a cause.

We have designed to do little more than announce the work now, and shall hope to do it more ample justice hereafter.

BEAUMARCHAIS AND HIS TIMES. Sketches of French Society in the Eighteenth Century, from unpublished Documents. By LOUIS DE LOMENIE. Translated by HENRY S. EDWARDS. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 460. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This work on "Beaumarchais and his Times," is one of the most curious books of the day. He has hitherto been known as rather a clever dramatist, and the author of "The Barber of Seville." His name, too, figures incidentally in our own "Revolutionary Annals," as an early friend of the Colonies; although Pitkin, in his History, subjects his character to the serious imputation of playing a double game for mercenary ends, an imputation of which he was fully capable, but which, we think, is in this case unsustained. But the volume before us presents Beaumarchais in another aspect; as the very prince

of intriguers. He had a perfect passion for secret plots and cunning artifices. The missions on which he was sent, by Louis XV, to save the reputation of one who had none to lose, Madame du Barry; and by Louis XVI, on a similar end, for Marie Antoinette; and the manner in which he fulfilled his work prove him to have been as adroit as he was unscrupulous. His whole life was full of incidents, it was in itself a drama; although the tragic and the comic are perpetually intermingled. The work is a striking and sad picture of social life in France before the French Revolution, and shows the awfully corrupt state of public morals in high and low life. Such a state of society alone could have produced a Beaumarchais. We need not say then that the work has an intense interest beyond that of a personal biography, and for obvious reasons, almost as much so in this country as in France. The original French copy we have not seen, but the translation is in good and vigorous English.

ROME, CHRISTIAN AND PAPAL. Sketches of its Religious Monuments and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, with Notices of the Jesuits and the Inquisition. By L. DE SANCTIS, D. D., formerly curate of the Magdelene, Professor of Theology in the Roman University, and Qualificator at the Inquisition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 261. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is precisely such a work as we might suppose would be written by an imperfectly educated and honest man on his first deliverance from the Church of Rome. It shows how great a service Mr. Meyrick and his friends are doing in scattering on the continent reliable information concerning the English Reformation and the English Church. The Author was a Roman by birth, occupied the confessional fifteen years, was eight years Curate of a large parish in Rome, visited the Monasteries as preacher and confessor, was Professor of Theology, and qualificator of the Inquisition. Since he became a "convert to the Protestant faith, he has for some years past labored as a devoted minister of the Waldensian, or Primitive Italian Church at Turin, Sardinia. Within a few weeks he has been chosen professor in one of the Swiss Universities. His present work is in the form of "Letters," in which he describes supposed conferences between *the Abbe* a Romanist, *M. Manton* a Puseyite, and *Pasquali* a Waldensian. The soundest Church principles and the grossest Romish errors are associated together under the name of Puseyism; Pasquali converts both the Puseyite and the Papist, and so the matter ends. The work also describes some of the gross corruptions at Rome in the practical working of the Romish system. It is untrue to the English Church, but will be popular among the sects.

REPORT TO THE VESTRY OF TRINITY CHURCH, New York, on the state of the Parish. By WILLIAM BERRIAN, D. D., Rector of the same. 1856.

The Vestry of this Parish lately called by Resolution on the Rector and his Assistants for the information which we here find given. Old Trinity, instead of being a "rich sinecure for retired clergymen," is beginning to do her work and is doing it well. The Report shows a record of 1100 Communicants, 433 Baptisms, 176 persons confirmed, and $16,431.84 given in charity. While, therefore, "Old Trinity" deserves all praise for what she has begun to do, it ought to be added, that there are single congregations in New York, each of which have given thousands of dollars in charity more than Trinity, with her four large congregations, and all their immense wealth.

LAKE NGAMI: Or, Explorations and Discoveries during Four Years' Wanderings in the Wilds of Southwestern Africa. By CHARLES JOHN ANDERSSON. With numerous Illustrations, representing sporting Adventures, Subjects of Natural History, Devices for Destroying Wild Animals, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 521. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is a work of considerable interest, and adds somewhat to our knowledge of the Geography of South Western Africa. The Author's Wanderings were con-

fined mostly to the region of Walfisch Bay and the country of the Hottentots or Namaguas, between the Bay and Cape Town. His most important discovery was of a route from the South-west coast to Lake Ngami, a sheet of water about thirty miles in length and seven in breadth in latitude 20° South. He gives brief accounts of the German Rhenish Missionaries, Messrs. Hahn, Rath, and Kolbe, among the Damaras, whose labors thus far have not been very successful. The country is uninviting, and the inhabitants whom the author describes with particularity, are exceedingly degraded and vicious. Mr. Anderson's hunting exploits, and his description of the wild beasts of the country are narrated with spirit, and the whole work is handsomely illustrated.

Occasional Papers from Saint Augustine's College, Canterbury, England. Nine Numbers. 1856.

We are indebted to the Rev. A. P. Moor, Sub-Warden of this Missionary College, for these interesting papers. They contain letters from former members of the College, now scattered in distant parts of the world, recording their labors, trials, encouragements, &c., &c. One writes from Natal, another from Australia, another from New Brunswick, another from Canada, another from the West Indies, &c., &c. There are letters also from our own Dr. Cole at Nashotah, and from Mr. Breck among the Chippewas. One of these English Missionaries writes as follows:

"One of the things that strike me most in the religious aspect of India is the prevalence of Deism and Pantheism, which are in reality numbering more disciples than, it is probable, any other creed: the common villager you will constantly find holding these opinions. They are both to be met, as far as I can see, only by opposing the certainty of revealed truth to the uncertainty of human reasoning, especially upon matters so abstruse: the seed of these enormous systems has been education and advancement without Christian teaching. Western knowledge has alienated the mind from idolatry, but there has been nothing but Deism or the Pantheism of the Vedas to fill up the blank. The History of Pantheism would be a very useful study to our Indian students."

Another writes, "Without any hesitation I may observe that the greatest difficulty colonial clergymen have to sustain, is the virulent and unwearied opposition of dissent. Any amount of labor, mental or physical, one gladly undergoes in the establishment of truth; but the trial, requiring all one's faith, and patience, and endurance, is when one's work is unscrupulously attacked, and one's self coarsely and personally assailed, by men whose belief of the Christian faith is for the most part of a *negative* character. I may state that any looseness, or latitudinarianism, with respect either to the dogmatic articles of our faith, or the distinctive principles of the Church, is speedily corrected by a brief sojourn in the colonies. Men see here, with pain, the bitterness and unceasing hostility manifested by the sects against the Church; and this too is generally joined with most deplorable ignorance. Any attempt to conciliate is met with bitter opposition, unless accompanied by a renunciation of the principles of the Church, and an admission of unordained men to the *status* of ministers of God. And the feeling is, I grieve to say, not uncommon among Churchmen."

After all, Church principles, human nature, and sectarianism are unchanged in their nature, temper, and methods, the world over.

Greatorex's Collection of Sacred Music. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1856.

This is a new edition of a work, which has been growing into favor since it was first published. It contains many compositions by its Author, which are unsurpassed for their sweet, flowing melodies, and chaste style. In the arrangements of the old tunes, those familiar with them as they have been used in this country will be surprised by new, sometimes strange harmonies, though the Author says in the preface, "That his aim has been to restore as nearly as practicable the old standard tunes and chants to their original harmonies." The large number of chants (more than one hundred) which the work contains, commends it to every Church choir. The organist of moderate ability will find in

the condensation of the parts upon two staves, an arrangement, which will render his task much less difficult, while at the same time, the singer will meet with no trouble from the greater number of characters, as the added parts are printed in small notes. The present edition has an Appendix consisting of Interludes in the different keys which will serve as models for the proper construction of these breathing points between the verses. The binding and typographical execution of the new work are in fine style, and give it an improved and attractive appearance. It deserves adoption into every Church Choir, and wherever a new book is needed, *this* is most cordially recommended.

ANDRE. A Tragedy in Five Acts. By W. W. LORD. New York: Charles Scribner 377 Broadway. 1856.

This work reached us too late for more than a brief notice. Without pretending to give a critical opinion on its dramatic merit we shall, for the present, only name some sources of interest which it seems to possess. Above all things, in this day of imitation and dilutions, we hail it as a serious and manly attempt to contribute somewhat to our legitimate national literature. It has taken for its subject by far the most interesting theme for dramatic effort in our American annals—a theme full of dignity and tenderness, historically grand and ideally suggestive, affording ample scope for the finest powers of tragic genius. The author handles it with evident enthusiasm and a thorough appreciation of its capabilities. The plot is simple and naturally evolved. The dramatis personæ, besides being happily individualized, are so managed as to make the reader feel that he is in the presence and amid the interests of living men. The style is grave and unambitious—free from sounding and brilliant claptrap, yet, where required, rising without effort to the noblest aspects of the theme. The action nowhere flags, but at every stage is characterized by vigor and directness. Altogether, we consider it a success in the most difficult branch of imaginative composition; and this is high praise.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS, IN GREEK AND ENGLISH, WITH AN ANALYSIS AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY. By SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation of Scripture in the Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of the Hebrew Language and Literature in Columbia College, N. Y., and Author of Commentaries on the Hebrews, Romans, and Ephesians. New York: Dana & Co., 381 Broadway. 1856. 8vo. p. 98.

In the last Number of the Review we noticed the commentary of Dr. Turner on the Ephesians, as in our view the most full and satisfactory of all his expositions of the Sacred Word. This exegesis of the Epistle to the Galatians is alike replete with the results of many years of profound and accomplished scholarship, and as we learn from the preface, was intended to be published in connection with that on the Ephesians. The delay was caused by a desire to examine a work then just announced, by Jowett, on the same Epistle. This, upon examination, is pronounced as in many respects quite meagre and indefinite, not to say of doubtful orthodoxy. This delay led to an acquaintance with another recent English production by Rev. Mr. Ellicott, which is highly commended as laying a solid foundation of safe interpretation in true grammatical principles, and gives the learned author occasion to express an opinion in his preface, which we venture to extract, and to commend to the *consciences* of all Christian teachers who embrace the classics within the range of their instructions—"An examination of this Commentary has served to confirm the opinion that the sound interpreter must also be the sound grammarian"—"may all our Academies and Colleges, which have in view the extension of Christian truth, and an acquaintance with the revealed documents which embody it, carefully, accurately, and thoroughly instruct their classes in that knowledge of Greek, which is the only solid human groundwork of New Testament interpretation." The Professors in our Theological Seminaries, who are brought in contact with the graduates of our Colleges and Universities, have, doubtless, learnt by vexa-

tions experience, that the want of thorough grammatical training is likely to become a characteristic of American classical scholarship.

If we were to find fault with this Commentary, in any respect, it would be in this, that Dr. Turner, with a modesty rare among Biblical interpreters, does not more often give his own critical and decided opinion upon certain disputed passages, in favor of one among many interpretations. Thus, for example, on the meaning of the phrase, "Now a mediator is not of one, but God is one,"—(chap. iii, 20)—a verse, "which has given rise to more numerous and diversified interpretations than any other in the Bible," many prominent opinions advanced by learned expositors are introduced and accompanied by remarks, but leaving the general reader in the wealth of exposition, somewhat bewildered, and unable to decide which view is plausible, and which is not. We should, however, in justice to the Doctor, quote in his own words the principle adopted by him as a rule in such cases:—"I hold it to be a great and important principle in the exposition of Scripture, as it is also in the illustration of the divine volume of nature, to advance in opinion just so far as the accessible and clearly settled data allow; and, consequently, when these are not sufficiently full or clear to justify an explicit, unequivocal, and decided expression of the meaning, thus to confess a proper degree of ignorance and uncertainty. In the inquiring, thoughtful and judicious mind, unfounded asser tion can never be made the substitute of satisfactory proof. It is better to acknowledge uncertainty than to decide with an air of positive and dogmatic infallibility. For this reason, I could not venture to express a decided opinion on some very difficult passages."

We refer briefly to two or three important portions of this Commentary, which will give a general idea of the author's style of exposition, and the thorough and searching analysis brought to bear upon the subject.

No little difficulty has arisen in explaining—"He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ," (chap iii, 16.) Many suppose that from the use of the singular number, the Apostle argues that the prophetic reference must be limited to one, and that the word "Christ" can only be understood of the Lord Jesus personally. Dr. Turner would translate the phrase "he saith" by the equivalent one "he means," and thus do away entirely with the idea that St. Paul intended to found any argument upon the use of the singular rather than the plural form. This rendering shows that the Apostle interpreted the promises to apply only to a particular one of the various classes of Abraham's descendants, that Christ is to be regarded here, not in his individuality, but in connection with his faithful body, ("Heirs according to the promise,") of which he is the head.

Directly following this we have presented at some length the different views of chronologists, upon the expression "four hundred and thirty years after," the time between the giving of the promise and of the law. This is given for the reader's information, the author not deeming the investigation of the subject necessary, in order to interpret the meaning of the Apostle.

The notes and explanations upon the last part of the 4th chapter, where the Apostle proceeds to give the allegorical bearing of certain facts in the life of Abraham, are very full and satisfactory. The translation of the sentence, "Which things are an allegory," the Dr. pronounces "loose and inaccurate," and denies that St. Paul ever represents the historical parts of the Old Testament as allegories.

In his view the facts referred to, are represented, in the same manner as par ables, to convey religious instruction "In a word, St. Paul regards Sarah and her son as prefigurative of the Christian Church and its spiritual members, while Hagar and Ishmael represent the Jewish community devoted to an external religion, which was characterized by elementary principles, mere rites and ceremonies of a fleshly nature. . . . . As Hagar's offspring was born in a state of servitude, so the Jews were subjected to the ritual law. As Isaac, the son of the free woman, was himself free, so are Christians free from the Jewish yoke. And as the two children were born, the one according to nature, and in his be-

havior showed his natural character, and the other by virtue of the divine promise, so unbelieving Jews are in their natural sinful condition, and act accordingly, while true Christians are born of the Spirit, and persecuted by their blinded opponents."

We shall only add the hope that the life of the author may be long spared to instruct the Christian Church with his varied learning and his reverential and luminous exposition of the SACRED SCRIPTURES.

QUESTIONS ON THE SUNDAY EVENING LESSONS IN THE CHURCH SERVICE. By a LAYMAN of the Diocese of Connecticut. New York: Gen. Protestant Episcopal S. School Union and Church Book Society, No. 637 Broadway. 1857.

A superintendent of one of the largest Sunday Schools in New England is the modest "Layman of the Diocese of Connecticut," who writes this unpretentious little volume. It is therefore a working book, thoroughly practical, and carefully adapted to satisfy a want that every S. School Teacher has felt, in endeavoring to make plain and interesting, to inquisitive little ones, the "things hard to be understood" of Prophet and Apostle. In this view, it would prove an admirable Sunday Evening exercise for every Christian family. The author breaks new ground, as neither diffuse Jackson nor admirable Burgess nor any other writer we are cognizant of, has prepared questions on the Evening Lessons. Hence it will be of great service to more advanced classes, who are about to leave S. School because there is nothing more to study. The question s are lead ing and suggestive, thus aiding both scholar and teacher. Add to these obvious considerations, the low price of the book, and we are sure it must be regarded as superior among the valuable little books that all find so useful in teaching a child "the way it should go."

HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY, STATICAL AND DYNAMICAL; OR THE CONDITIONS AND COURSE OF THE LIFE OF MAN. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. Illustrated with nearly 300 Wood Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 649.

The author of this work, by his previously published researches in chemistry and other departments of science, has acquired the character of a ripe scholar, an ingenious experimenter, a philosophical observer, and a logical reasoner. As remarked in the preface to this work, "The Science of Physiology is the result of the labors of thousands of the ablest men continued for centuries." A complete text book of the science must therefore be mainly a judicious compilation of these labors. Prof. Draper's book, however, is by no means a mere compilation. Much original observation and reasoning are exhibited throughout the work, which will of course be more liable to criticism than a work possessing less claims to originality. It is a learned and labored effort to extend the application of physical principles to the explanation of the phenomena of life. Perhaps the author may be regarded as enthusiastic in his expectation of a complete subjection of physiology to the domain of exact science. Most physiologists of the present day will hardly venture to expect a philosophical explanation, on strict physical principles, of all the influences and operations of what is termed the "vital principle," or of the "plastic power" of our author. This volume, however will be studied with interest by all who have a taste for an ingenious and profound investigation of the science of life.

The illustrations, many of which are new and well devised, are numerous, and much better executed than are found in most works of this class.

CONSTITUTION, &c., of the Alumni of the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va. 1856.

REGISTER OF THE COLLEGE OF ST. JAMES, Maryland. 1856.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT of the New England Female Medical College. Boston 1856.

Constitution, &c., of the Hartford (Conn.) Young Men's Association. 1856-57.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Barnwell, R. W.	Davis,	Sept. 21,	Holy Cross, Stateburg, S. C.
Bringhurst, Geo. H.	Potter, A.	Sept. 20,	St. Philip's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Byllesby, Morrison,	Potter, A.	Sept. 14,	St. Paul's, Chester, Pa.
Carroll, Wm. R.	Potter, A.	Oct. 26,	Holy Trinity, Westchester, Pa.
Drumm, Thomas,	Potter, A.	Oct. 26,	Holy Trinity, Westchester, Pa.
Dudley, H. C. Hamilton,	Doane,	Oct. 26,	St. Paul's, Newark, N. J.
Ely, William,	Potter, A.	Oct. 5,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Haven, John H.	Smith,	Oct. 26,	St. Paul's, Newport, Ky.
Hayward, Stephen G.	DeLancey,	Nov. 16,	St. Paul's, Syracuse, W. N. Y.
Hutchinson, Daniel F.	Lee, H. W.	Nov. 19,	St. Paul's, Durant, Iowa.
Latane, James,	Meade,	Sept. 19,	Christ, Millwood, Va.
McClure, Edward,	McCoskry,	Nov. 11,	Trinity, Marshall, Mich.
Phillips, H. L.	Davis,	Nov. 25,	St. Stephen's, Charleston, S. C.
Rogers, Silas M.	Potter, H.	Nov. 3,	Trinity, Plattsburg, N. Y.
Spofford, Henry A.	Potter, H.	July 6,	Zion, New York City.
Trivett, Robert C.	Potter, H.	Sept. 10,	Christ, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Woodruff, Curtis T.	Potter, H.	July 6,	Zion, New York City.
Winne, Frederick P.	Potter, H.	Oct. 31,	St. Paul's, Albany, N. Y.

PRIESTS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev. Barclay, C. C.	Whitehouse,	Dec. 7,	St. James', Chicago, Ill.
" Davis, Richard T.	Meade,	Sept. 19,	Christ, Millwood, Va.
" Ernst, John F.	Upfold,	Nov. 26,	Christ, Madison, Indiana.
" Johnson, Philip A.	Lee, H. W.	Sept. 7,	Trinity, Davenport, Iowa.
" Lance, Lucien C.	Davis,	Nov. 25,	St. Stephen's, Charleston, S. C.
" Locke, DeWitt C.	Whitehouse,	Sept. 10,	Atonement, Chicago, Ill.
" Munroe, Wm. H.	Eastburn,	Sept. 25,	Messiah, Boston, Mass.
" Powers, H. N.	Potter, A.	Sept. 21,	St. James', Lancaster, Pa.
" Reese, Jr., Geo. B.	Potter, A.	Sept. 11,	St. Mark's, New Milford, Pa.
" Southgate, Wm. Scott,	Burgess,	Oct. 28,	St. Luke's, Portland, Me.
" Stickney, Geo. Waldo,	Cobbs,	Sept. 24,	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Brandon Church,	Johns,	Nov. 8,	Prince George, Va.
Calvary,	Potter, A.	Oct. 12,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Grace,	Whittingham,	Oct. 30,	Baltimore, Md.
Grace,	Kip,	Nov. 9,	Sacramento, Cal.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*ime.*	*Place.*
Grace Chapel,	Doane,	Nov. 10,	Hoboken, N. J.
Holy Trinity,	Potter, H.	Sept. 23,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Mapsico Church,	Johns,	Nov. 7,	Charles City, Va.
St. Andrew's,	Williams,	Sept. 10,	Marbledale, Conn.
St. John Baptist,	Potter, H.	Dec. 2,	New York City.
St. John's,	DeLancey,	Sept. 18,	Mount Morris, W. N. Y.
St. Luke's Chapel,	Whittingham,	Aug. 26,	Bladensburg, Md.
St. Matthew's,	Davis,	Sept. 20,	Sumter District, S. C.
St. Paul's,	Lee, H. W.	Nov. 19,	Durant, Iowa.
St. Philip's,	Burgess,	Nov. 12,	Wiscassett, Maine.

OBITUARY.

Died, at St. Andrew's Parsonage, Richmond, Staten Island, on Tuesday evening, Sept. 30th, Rev. David Moore, D. D., in the 70th year of his age.

In the death of this venerable man, a link of the chain connecting the present generation with the past has been sundered. Around his memory cluster many associations of by-gone days. Dr. Moore was the eldest son of the Rt. Rev. Channing Moore, late Bishop of the Diocese of Virginia. For 46 years he has ministered at the altar of St. Andrew's, succeeding his father, who for nearly 25 years was Rector of the same Church. Naturally robust and healthy, and of a very active and nervous temperament, he has ever faithfully performed the duties of his sacred office, and for many years no change could be observed except as his locks whitened with advancing age. For nearly half a century has he upheld the banner of the Cross, and exerted a wide influence for good. In his intercourse with his parishioners, his simplicity, his kind-heartedness, and the unaffected dignity of his deportment commanded and won the respect of all. No one could see him in their midst—his noble form with all the adornments, without the infirmities of age; his eye, beaming with the love and peace which dwelt in his heart—without doing him involuntary homage. Well may we say of him, that he died, "full of years, and full of honors." After a long term of service, faithfully discharged, has he been taken from his flock and the community, to rest in the bosom of his God. Few men have lived who performed all the duties of the Christian pastor with such devotion and zeal; and never was one more beloved by the people entrusted to his care. Through snow and rain, sunshine and shade, by day or night, would he travel through his parish to administer to the spiritual wants of his flock; and his forgetfulness of self in his arduous duties has, doubtless, shortened his useful life. His funeral was attended at the Old Parish Church where the deceased and his father had ministered for 70 years, by a large concourse of people, the Clergy of the Island, and many of the Clergy of the city of New York,—Rev Dr. Bedell preaching the sermon. Suitable resolutions of respect to his memory were passed by the Clergy present, and also by the Wardens and Vestry of St. Andrews', who directed that the Churches of which the deceased was Rector, St. Andrews', Richmond, and Trinity, Castleton, should be draped in mourning for one year.

Died, in Worcester, Mass., on Tuesday, 4th of November, 1856, the Rev. Nathaniel T. Bent.

Rev. Mr. Bent, at the time of his death, was the Principal of Herbert Hall, Worcester, where his talents caused him to be highly appreciated as a teacher. During the active years of his ministry, he was the popular and efficient Rector of several prominent churches in the Diocese of Massachusetts, and at one time was also Rector of St. John's Church, Bangor, Maine.

In accordance with his dying request, the Rev. Dr. Vinton, of Boston, and the Rev. Thomas. R. Lambert, of Charlestown, officiated at his funeral.

DIED, on Monday, September 8th, at Cave Spring, Georgia, the Rev. WILLIAM McAULEY, aged 26 years.

The subject of this brief notice commenced his classical education in the London University, and resumed his studies after an interruption of a few years, in this country. He was admitted in December, 1855, as a candidate for Holy Orders in the Diocese of Western New York, under the Right Rev. Bishop DeLancey; but in consequence of the delicate state of his health, was transferred to Georgia, where he was ordained Deacon by the Right Rev. Bishop Elliott, 12th May, 1856, at St. James' Church, Marietta, Georgia. He was immediately called to take charge of the Church at Cave Spring, Floyd county, Georgia, but on account of his declining strength was unable to officiate.

In the midst of kind friends, and attended by the assiduous care of a devoted sister, he gently sunk into the arms of death, having the testimony of a good conscience, in the communion of the Catholic Church, in the confidence of a certain faith, in the comfort of a reasonable, religious and holy hope, in favor with his God, and in perfect charity with the world.

DIED, at Charleston, South Carolina, Sept. 11, 1856, the Rev. JOSEPH AUGUSTUS SHANKLIN, Rector of St. Peter's Church, aged 34 years.

Mr. S. was a native of Pendleton, South Carolina, and graduated at the Virginia University at the early age of 19 years, with the degree of Master of Arts. After receiving his degree he commenced the study of Law, and from his talents and industry, had every prospect of becoming distinguished in his profession. But about this time, returning to Pendleton, his attention was attracted to the Episcopal Church, his connections in boyhood having been with another religious body. After a careful examination, he formed a warm and enlightened attachment to the Liturgy, doctrine and Worship of the Church, and feeling himself called of God to preach the Gospel, he soon after became a candidate for Orders, and entered the Theological Seminary of Virginia. Having completed his course of study, Mr. Shanklin was admitted to the diaconate by the Right Rev. Bishop Elliott, of Georgia, in January, 1845, in Christ Church, Savannah, and was immediately appointed by the Bishop, missionary to St. Mary's, where he remained nearly two years. On the 15th of August, 1846, in the chapel attached to St. Luke's Church, Montpelier, Bishop Elliott ordained Mr. Shanklin to the priesthood. In January, 1847, Mr. S. took charge of Christ Church, Macon, Georgia, where he officiated till the fall of 1854, when he received and accepted a call to St. Peter's Church, Charleston. In addition to his pastoral labors, Mr. S. was at his decease, one of the editors of the Southern Episcopalian. In the October Number of this Periodical, we find a warm tribute to his fidelity as a pastor, and to his fortitude in exposure to the fearful pestilence which, in his death, deprived the Church of one of her most valuable ministers. This Periodical states that "Mr. Shanklin's funeral took place at St. Peter's Church, on Friday, September the 12th, at ten o'clock A.M. The church was hung in black; a very large congregation, including the Clergy of all the denominations in the city were present; the service was read by the Rev. C. P. Gadsden, and the remains were conveyed to their last resting place, in the rear of the church, by the Clergy of the Episcopal Church. Never have we seen a more affected congregation than was present. A deep solemnity reigned over all; and, while our tears flowed, we felt that it was not for him we wept, but 'for ourselves and our children.'"

DIED, in Beaufort, South Carolina, October 30th, the Rev. JULIUS W. STUART, assistant Rector of Grace Church, Charleston.

Mr. Stuart had just commenced his career, as a minister of the Church, having been ordained Deacon, by Bishop Davis, the 22d of June, 1856. With the highest prospects of future usefulness it has pleased God to remove him, to the enjoyment of eternal felicity.

CHURCH STATISTICS OF THE SEVERAL DIOCESES.

Episcopal Acts.			Ordinations.			
Dioceses.	Bishops.	Total No. Clergy.	Deacons.	Priests.	Candidates.	Confirmations.
Maine	George Burgess	18	6	2	4	273
New Hampshire	Carlton Chase	14		3	1	132
Vermont	John Henry Hopkins	20	1	2	2	239
Massachusetts	Manton Eastburn	77	9	6	9	960
Rhode Island	Thomas M. Clark	32	3	2	2	488
Connecticut	Thomas Church Brownell. John Williams	122	26	18	27	1,938
New York	Horatio Potter	309	49	27	36	5,778
Western N. Y.	William H. DeLancey	120	10	13	14	2,294
New Jersey	George W. Doane	80	9	10	14	1,417
Pennsylvania	Alonzo Potter	161	21	18	28	3,242
Delaware	Alfred Lee	19	3	1	3	279
Maryland	William R. Whittingham	147	11	16	16	2,511
Virginia	William Meade. John Johns	111	20	16	12	1,400
North Carolina	Thomas Atkinson	45	10	8	7	804
South Carolina	Thomas F. Davis	70	5	5	8	1,853
Georgia	Stephen Elliott, Jr.	22	2	2	5	577
Florida	Francis H. Rutledge	7	2	1		210
Alabama	Nicholas H. Cobbs	28	6	6	4	547
Mississippi	William M. Green	31	4	5	4	491
Louisiana	Leonidas Polk	32	1	4	3	559
Texas	George W. Freeman	15	2	1		105
Tennessee	James H. Otey	21	3	3	4	291
Kentucky	Benjamin B. Smith	31	3	4	2	513
Ohio	Charles P. McIlvaine	86	16	16	5	1,212
Indiana	George Upfold	24	5	9	4	364
Illinois	Henry J. Whitehouse	49	4	5	9	733
Michigan	Samuel A. McCoskry	40	8	6	2	404
Missouri	Cicero S. Hawks	23	5	4	3	320
Wisconsin	Jackson Kemper	46	8	10	12	468
Iowa	Henry W. Lee	20	1	4	3	132
California	William Ingraham Kip	10	1			116
		1830	254	227	243	30,650
In 1853,		1651	146	149	176	23,884
In 1850,		1558	221	228	120	18,937

The above and following Tables are compiled from the Report of the Committee on the State of the Church, to the General Convention for 1856. Of course the official acts reported, are for three years. The only State of our Union, in which there is no organized Diocese, is Arkansas.

Bishops.—Besides the 33 here enumerated, are the Missionary Bishop of Oregon, the two Foreign Missionary Bishops, the returned Bishop Southgate, and the two Bishops Onderdonk, the latter of whom, since the remission of his sentence of suspension, is a Bishop without jurisdiction.

Abstract of Diocesan Reports.			Sunday Schools.		Baptisms.		
Dioceses.	Communicants.	Gain since 1853.	Teachers.	Scholars or Catechumens.	Infants.	Adults.	Total.
Maine	996	129	111	772	386	134	520
New Hampshire	581	4	42	358	165	40	205
Vermont	1,929	104			293	96	389
Massachusetts	6,027	418		4,350	2,504	286	2,790
Rhode Island	2,732	232	320	2,259	679	205	884
Connecticut	10,389	221	1075	6,107	2,721	697	3,418
New York	22,549	2,867	2202	19,113	12,398	1407	13,805
Western New York	9,226	1,126	932	5,505	3,768	870	4,638
New Jersey	4,332	762			2,304	399	2,703
Pennsylvania	12,816	216	1772	16,891	8,002	1016	9,018
Delaware	813	163	189	1,379	468	69	537
Maryland	9,586	1,526	374	3,600	6,043	621	6,664
Virginia	6,527	1,228	648	4,180	2,371	482	2,853
North Carolina	2,475	475		1,344	1,918	370	2,288
South Carolina	5,993	396	210	1,716	2,976	891	3,867
Georgia	1,736	616		1,499			1,047
Florida	515	105					
Alabama	1,461	430	120	1,000	1,206	275	1,481
Mississippi	1,037	465	97	673	1,112	409	1,521
Louisiana	1,421	301	65	1,287			2,373
Texas	500				238	45	283
Tennessee	862	92			564	119	683
Kentucky	1,465	303	181	1,881	900	192	1,092
Ohio	4,992	501	434	3,253	1,492	268	1,760
Indiana	1,058	212	134	834	520	136	656
Illinois	2,393	731			1,272	226	1,498
Michigan	1,962		163	1,039	914	196	1,110
Missouri	1,098	283	96	665	572	71	643
Wisconsin	1,172	29		1,351			1,192
Iowa	500	300					241
California	383	new.		409	350	22	372
	119,526	*14,390		81,465	56,136	9542	†70,531
In 1853	105,136			62,376			48,157
In 1850	79,802			38,603			42,925

* Nett. † Not specified, 4853.

Clergy.—If the Clergy in Minnesota, Arkansas, Kansas, Oregon and Washington, were added, we suppose the number would not be less than 1850.

Confirmations.—The increase of numbers under this head is very remarkable. Yet if all those who have been confirmed had become Communicants, we should have had a gain of at least 20,000, instead of less than 15,000, under the latter head.

Communicants.—Only two Dioceses report fewer communicants than they did three years ago; and this *may* arise from some defectiveness in the Reports made to the last Conventions of those Dioceses.

The summary under this head, for 1850, does not include the large Diocese of New York. With that it would probably have been nearly 95,000.

MISSIONS.

The Triennial Report of the Board to the General Convention gives the following summary for the three years last past:—

DOMESTIC.

Receipts:

Oct. 1, 1853, to Oct. 1, 1854,	$38,404 15	
Oct. 1, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,	42,107 60	
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct. 1, 1856,	47,245 17	
		$127,756 92
In previous three years,		85,837 45
Increase,		$41,919 47

Payments:—

Oct. 1, 1853, to Oct. 1, 1854,	$40,037 85	
Oct. 1, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,	42,892 73	
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct. 1, 1856,	51,917 15	
		$134,847 73
In previous three years,		85,719 40
Increase,		$49,128 33

FOREIGN.

Receipts:

June 15, 1853, to June 15, 1854,	$59,582 23	
June 15, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,	71,480 27	
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct. 1, 1856,	69,701 58	
		$200,764 08
In previous three years,		126,501 06
Increase,		$74,263 02

Payments:—

June 15, 1853, to June 15, 1854,	$57,292 10	
June 15, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,	76,226 71	
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct 1, 1856,	69,761 21	
		$203,280 02
In previous three years,		127,781 08
Increase,		$75,498 94

As to Missionaries they report:—

DOMESTIC.

In October, 1854,—108 stations, 90 Missionaries.
In October, 1855,—122 stations, 102 Missionaries.
In October, 1856,—144 stations, 126 Missionaries.

FOREIGN.

In Africa, China, and Greece,

Missionaries,	20
Assistants,	20
Native Teachers,	12
Pupils,	1413

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

Form 418